# Evaluation of the CSM

# **Civil Society Mechanism**

# for relations with the CFS

Patrick Mulvany and Christina Schiavoni

Evaluation Conducted for the CSM Coordination Committee

# **Final Report**

Submitted May 2014; Revised August 2014

# Table of Contents

	List of t	ables	ii
	Abbrev	iations	.iii
	Executi	ve summary	v
1	Abou	It the evaluation process	. 1
	1.1	Background	. 1
	1.2	Purpose and objectives of the evaluation	. 1
	1.3	Methodology	. 1
	1.4	People consulted	. 1
	1.5	Limitations	. 2
2	Abou	ut the CSM	. 3
	2.1	Overview	. 3
	2.2	Structures	. 4
	2.3	Finances	. 5
3	Activ	vities of CSM bodies	. 7
	3.1	Coordination Committee	. 7
	3.2	Members of the CFS Advisory Group	. 9
	3.3	Finance sub-Working Group	10
	3.4	Policy Working Groups	11
	3.4.1	Land Tenure	11
	3.4.2	Agricultural Investment	12
	3.4.3	Global Strategic Framework	13
	3.4.4	Gender	14
	3.4.5	Nutrition	14
	3.4.6	Price Volatility	15
	3.4.7	Protracted Crisis & Conflict	16
	3.4.8	Monitoring and Accountability	17
	3.4.9	Social Protection	17
	3.4.10	Climate Change	18
	3.4.11	Biofuels	19
	3.5	Annual CSM Forum	20
	3.6	Secretariat	21
4	Cond	lusions	23
	4.1	Engagement with the CFS	23
	4.2	Outreach	24
	4.3	Internal Organisation	25
	4.4	Capacity development	26
	4.5	Final Remarks	27

5	Annexes	. 29
	Annex 1: Selected Bibliography of CSM Documents 2009 – 2013	. 29
	Annex 2: Timeline of Key CSM Meetings through April 2014	. 35
	Annex 3: CSM Expenditure 2001 – 2013	. 45
	Annex 4: Terms of Reference for the CSM External Evaluation	. 47
	Annex 5: Programme for CSM Evaluation	. 49
	Annex 6: Questionnaire for CSM Assessment	. 51
	Annex 7: The consultants assigned to conduct the Evaluation	. 53
	Annex 8: The CSM Founding Document	. 55

# List of tables

- Table 1 CSM Total Expenditure 2011 2013 (data provided by CSM Secretariat)
- Table 2 Timeline of CC Meetings

# Abbreviations

A4A	Agenda for Action for Addressing Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises
AG	Advisory Group of the CFS Bureau
AMIS	Agricultural Market Information System
СС	Coordination Committee (CSM)
CFS	United Nations Committee on World Food Security
CSM	International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism for Relations with the CFS
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GSF	Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition (CFS)
ICARRD	International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development
IPC	International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty
HLPE	High Level Panel of Experts (CFS)
MDTF	Multi-Donor Trust Fund (FAO)
MYPOW	Multi-Year Programme of Work (CFS)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OPCP	Office of Partnerships, Advocacy and Capacity Development (Partnerships branch) (FAO)
OEWG	Open Ended Working Group (CFS)
rai	CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems
TGs	Tenure Guidelines (see also VGGT)
ToRs	Terms of Reference
TT	Task Team (CFS)
VGGT	Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the context of national food security (also known as TGs)
WG	Policy Working Group (CSM)
UN	United Nations

# **Executive summary**

From this evaluation, it appears that the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) has provided the United Nations Committee on World Food Security (CFS) with increased credibility. It has successfully facilitated engagement by civil society in the CFS, thereby enriching the outreach, functioning and quality of debate in the CFS. It has already contributed to significant outcomes such as the Tenure Guidelines (TGs). The CSM is at the forefront of a vitally important project of inclusive governance but is still a 'work in progress' needing ongoing assessment and refinement. It is timely that the CSM has embarked upon this evaluation and a process of internal reflection.

# **The Civil Society Mechanism**

The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) is the largest international mechanism of civil society organisations (CSOs) seeking to influence agriculture, food security and nutrition policies and actions - nationally, regionally and globally. Its purpose is to facilitate civil society participation in the context of the United Nations Committee on World Food Security (CFS). In the reform process of the CFS in 2009, member States recognised the right of CSOs to "autonomously establish a global mechanism for food security and nutrition which will function as a facilitating body for CSO/NGOs consultation and participation in the CFS". A proposal for the establishment of the CSM was endorsed by CSOs at the Civil Society Forum held in Rome in October 2010 and subsequently acknowledged by CFS member States at the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the CFS. The CSM comprises civil society networks with strong relevance to issues of food security and nutrition, with particular attention to organisations representing peasant, small-scale and family farmers, artisanal fisherfolk, herders/pastoralists, landless, urban poor, agricultural and food workers, women, youth, consumers, Indigenous Peoples, and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) whose mandates and activities are concentrated in the areas of concern to the CFS.

The CSM facilitates the participation of CSOs in the work of the CFS, including input to negotiations and decision-making in CFS Plenary Sessions, Open Ended Working Groups, Task Teams, the CFS Bureau's Advisory Group and other CFS mechanisms, and interacts with the CFS Secretariat. It convenes an annual CSM Forum as a preparatory event before CFS sessions and provides a space for dialogue between a wide range of civil society actors where different positions can be expressed and debated. The CSM presents common positions to the CFS where they emerge and the range of different positions where there is no consensus. The CSM is governed by a Coordination Committee (CC), representing 11 constituencies and 17 sub-regions, that oversees its work from which it selects four members for the Advisory Group of the CFS Bureau, aiming to achieve gender and geographic balance. It is supported by a Secretariat based in Rome.

The CSM has established 11 Policy Working Groups (WGs) to develop civil society positions, through consulting with CSM members, on policy issues within the CFS and to present the views of CSOs in CFS negotiations, discussions, consultations and decision-making. They are: Land Tenure; Agricultural Investment; Global Strategic Framework; Gender; Nutrition; Price Volatility; Protracted Crisis & Conflict; Monitoring & Accountability; Social Protection; Climate Change; Biofuels; and the CFS Programme of Work. These promote dialogue and common positions amongst CSOs on issues being discussed in the CFS. They provide a space for CSOs to develop strong and well-articulated civil society positions for CFS negotiations. They should be coordinated by CC members and, in some cases, have technical facilitators provided by CSM members.

# **The Evaluation**

The CC decided in October 2013 to commission an evaluation of the performance and functioning of the CSM and to engage in a process to help the CC to reflect internally on this and make necessary changes. The CC mandated their members of the CFS Advisory Group (AG) to facilitate and coordinate the evaluation. The objectives of the evaluation are to explore proposals about: 1) how to strengthen and/or widen the scope of participation of small-scale food providers, workers, social movements and food insecure communities in the CSM; 2) how the CSM could be stronger and better able to set the agenda of the CFS; and 3) how to improve the functioning of the CSM.

The CC engaged two consultants, who had no direct role in the CSM, to carry out the evaluation and engage with the CC in the process of internal reflection. The mode of operation of the consultants has been 1) to actively engage as many CC members as possible in the process, and 2) to ensure that the assessment is objective and neutral. The main input to the evaluation came from interviews and questionnaires that were prepared by the CC and included different types of questions for reflecting on the performance of the CC/AG members, CSM Secretariat, the Policy Working Groups, and the wider CSM meetings.

Up until the date of completion of the draft report (May 2014), 85 questionnaires (in 3 languages) were sent to all present and former members of the CC and the Secretariat, as well as a number of WG members, some interpreters and a few people external to the CSM. Of this total, 46 completed questionnaires have been returned. These include responses from 23 members of the current CC, with another three promising their contribution. The consultants have also interviewed 25 people by Skype and plan to continue interviews over subsequent weeks as part of the internal reflection process. In addition, summarised information about the CSM, its activities and impacts, were provided to the consultants by the Secretariat. All contributions made are confidential and none of the material in this report is attributed to anyone who contributed to this evaluation.

# **The Conclusions**

## **Engagement with the CFS**

Civil Society has enriched the outreach, functioning and quality of debate in the CFS. The CSM has constantly pushed the focus of the CFS back to the root causes of hunger and malnutrition, the need to give priority attention to the women and men small-scale producers, who provide the food for most people in the world, and the resources they need to continue production in socially and environmentally sustainable ways; and to ensure that the CFS contributes towards the realisation of the Right to Food. The CSM's contributions have yielded tangible outcomes in the major thematic areas on the CFS agenda, albeit to varying degrees. This is evident, at times, in agreed language in Decision Boxes and accompanying text, improvements in awareness of negotiators, and in historic outputs of the CFS, such as the internationally recognised Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land Fisheries and Forests in the context of national food security (VGGT).

Having the necessary leadership by social movements and/or impacted constituencies in the CSM's Policy Working Groups (WGs) continues to be identified as a challenge. The renewed commitment by the CC to nominate one or more members, particularly from social movements, as coordinator(s) of each WG is a step forward in ensuring that there is political leadership. Additionally, successful functioning of the WGs appears to be enhanced by having experienced technical facilitation to back up the leadership and give guidance to the WGs. It has also been helpful to the success of the WGs when they have had a proactive as opposed to a reactive approach to their engagement with the CFS. There is interest in having the CSM members of the AG deepen their efforts to facilitate engagement with potential government and institutional allies in order to increase the political acceptance of CSM proposals by the CFS. A further challenge is to limit unplanned workloads in response to the CFS's agenda. To address this, the CC could give higher priority to making a careful inventory of upcoming issues on the CFS agenda and plan strategically how best for the CSM to engage. Moreover, the CC could initiate bolder collective processes among CSOs, beyond the current agenda of the CFS, in order to influence the CFS agenda in the future.

## Outreach

Over the course of three years, the CSM has managed to expand the network of CSOs that are connected to it, as evidenced by increasing numbers of participants in the Annual CSM Forums and subscribers to the email list of the CSM, and the growing number of people engaged in CSM Policy Working Groups, some of whose mailing lists are now over 100 people. To help facilitate CSM outreach and communication, the CSM website, managed by the Secretariat, has been improved to ensure better access to the wealth of information relevant to the CSM. As interest in the CSM grows, it will be important to strengthen awareness raising and communication mechanisms, using both electronic and other methods, to inform a wider range of people, to bring in new CSM members and to keep current members sufficiently connected with CSM processes. Improved guidance by CC members to the Secretariat could improve efficiencies. Some non-CC members of the CSM have expressed that they would appreciate even more updates on some issues through the website, and from CC members directly through the communications channels that should be linking CC members with their constituencies and sub-regions.

The CSM took a major step forward in 2013 through resourcing CSM consultations in seven different subregions. Some expressed that these consultations were an invaluable way of raising levels of awareness of and involvement in the CFS, and the issues it addresses, among CSOs in their regions. At the same time, a challenge associated with these consultations was an expressed lack of coordination between regional and constituency representatives of the CC in the organisation of the consultations. Greater partnership between constituency and regional representatives on the CC could help to increase communication, improve transparency in decision making and ensure better participation in the CSM. Additionally, in light of current outreach limitations of CC members, given the multiple demands placed upon them, it could be helpful for the CC to think of ways in which outreach capacity could be strengthened, for instance, each CC member having a designated partner in his/her sub-region/constituency who is focused on outreach.

## **Internal Organisation**

It bears recognition that the very establishment and functioning of the CSM, as the largest international mechanism of CSOs seeking to influence agriculture, food security and nutrition policies and actions from the ground level to the global level, are achievements in and of themselves. In three years, the CSM has managed to: establish a Coordination Committee comprised of the major constituencies concerned with the Right to Food and Food Sovereignty, as well as most of the major sub-regions of the world; select civil society representatives on the CFS Advisory Group, each year; organise more than 10 Policy Working Groups; and establish a permanent secretariat. That said, there are a number of growing pains, particularly related to the internal organisation of the CSM, which will be important to address in order for it to function to its full potential.

There is the need to review and reaffirm the roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of the various bodies of the CSM and of the individuals who participate in them. Thus, the CSM Founding Document and ToRs for each body within the CSM could be revisited in this light. The process for renewal and selection of CC members could also be revisited, including the appointment of new CC representatives or the re-selection of current ones. Similarly, the process for the nomination of members of the CFS AG for the next two-year cycle of the CC bears discussion, with improved clarity about their additional roles, responsibilities and accountabilities. Furthermore, possibilities for broadening leadership within CC constituencies and sub-regions could be explored, drawing from the CSM Founding Document. Finally, increased support for constituency and sub-regional consultations, and improved communications and capacities, could strengthen the internal organisation of the CSM from the grassroots to global levels.

## **Capacity Development**

Attempting to live up to the ambitious mandate of the CSM requires a tremendous amount of work by all parties involved. As a number of those active in the CSM have indicated, feeling unequally overstretched, and/or feeling that their efforts were not being recognised by others, reduces motivation. This makes it important to look at capacity constraints and workloads within the CSM. For CC members, an inherent challenge identified by a number of respondents in the evaluation process are the pressures of the CC itself; most CC members are, unsurprisingly, high-level leaders of their respective movements/networks who are often already stretched beyond capacity in their work outside of the CC. Thus, capacity constraints facing CC members point to a need for dialogue and strategising on how they can be further supported in carrying out their work (and on how realistic their current mandates and workloads are), especially to ensure that often overstretched social movement leaders can play their indispensable political role.

There are a number of additional capacity issues of the CSM that bear mentioning. It could be helpful to review the ToRs for both the CC members of the AG and for the Finance and Administrative sub-Working Group in light of current capacity constraints and needs. Also, given the critical role of technical facilitators in most CSM Policy Working Groups, the question of how to manage and resource this work in a transparent way could bear further discussion. Furthermore, addressing the issue of strengthening the decision-making processes of the CC would be helpful in reducing capacity constraints faced by the CSM Secretariat. Additionally, language remains an ongoing capacity challenge for the CSM, pointing to additional resources and strategising needed to enable full participation by non-English speakers and increase awareness of the issues covered by the CFS.

# **Final Remarks**

The CSM is clearly an important mechanism for inclusion of civil society in the global governance of food security and nutrition, and it is effective. Documentation from the early days of the CSM emphasises, however, an evolving process that would need ongoing evaluation and refinement. Three years into its progression, amidst the many strides that the CSM has made, one concern is that some of these more evaluative and reflective processes intended to be built into the CSM have taken somewhat of a backseat to other, more seemingly urgent and time-bound, priorities. If not addressed, however, this could ultimately undermine the efficacy of the CSM. It is therefore quite timely that the CSM has embarked upon this evaluation and process of internal reflection. The CSM has an important future in ensuring the CFS delivers the leadership necessary in the face of pressing global challenges.

# **1** About the evaluation process

# 1.1 Background

The Civil Society Mechanism for relations with the UN Committee on World Food Security (CSM) was set up as a self-organising and autonomous mechanism for facilitating CSO relations with the Committee on World Food Security (CFS). Its Founding Document "Proposal for an International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism for Relations with the CFS"<sup>1</sup> was acknowledged by the 36<sup>th</sup> session of the CFS (CFS 36) as the way it would engage with civil society. This calls on the CSM to conduct a review after 3 years. The CSM is governed by its Coordination Committee (CC).

# 1.2 Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

The CC met during October 2013 and decided to commission an evaluation of the performance and functioning of the CSM and to engage in a process to reflect internally on this and make necessary changes. They mandated the CC members in the CFS Advisory Group (AG) to facilitate and coordinate the evaluation.

The objectives of the evaluation are to explore proposals about:

- 1) how to strengthen and/or widen the scope of participation of small-scale food providers, workers, social movements and food insecure communities in the CSM;
- 2) how the CSM could be stronger and better able to set the agenda of the CFS; and
- 3) how to improve the functioning of the CSM.

# 1.3 Methodology

The CC engaged two consultants, who had no direct role in the CSM, to carry out the evaluation and engage with the CC in the process of internal reflection. The mode of operation of the consultants has been 1) to actively engage as many CC members as possible in the process, and 2) to ensure that the assessment is objective and neutral.

The main input to the evaluation came from questionnaires, prepared by the CC. These were sent by the CSM Secretariat to: all present and former members of the Coordination Committee and the Secretariat; key members of Policy Working Groups; some members of the interpretation/translation team; and a few people outside of the CSM. Interviews were conducted with a stratified selection of respondents, respecting constituency, geography and gender. The interviews will continue as part of the internal reflection process.

The questionnaires included different types of questions for reflecting on both the performance of the CC/AG members, CSM Secretariat, the Working Groups, and the wider CSM meetings. The questionnaires included questions about each individual's engagement in the CSM process and questions about what went well, what was challenging, what hindered progress and potential ways forward in relation to the functioning of all structures of the CSM. The interviews followed similar lines of questioning. All the information was provided in confidence and guarantees were given that it would be used without attribution. The evaluation process also built on previous reports about the work of the CSM and its Working Groups. These, and summarised information about the CSM, its activities and impacts, were provided to the consultants by the Secretariat, on request.

# **1.4 People consulted**

Up until the date of completion of this report, the consultants, with the help of the Secretariat, have sent out 85 email requests with appropriate questionnaires (in 3 languages) to all present and past members of the CC and the Secretariat, as well as a number of WG members and some interpreters. Of this total, 46 completed questionnaires have been returned. These include responses from 23 members of the current CC, with another three promising their contribution. The consultants have also interviewed 25 people by Skype and plan to continue interviews over subsequent weeks as part of the internal reflection process. All contributions made

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The CSM Founding Document can be found at <u>www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/019/k9215e.pdf</u>.

are confidential and none of the material in this report is attributed to anyone who contributed to this evaluation.

# 1.5 Limitations

The major limitation was the time available for analysing the questionnaires, conducting interviews and reading documents. Agreement to start the evaluation process was delayed, allowing just over a month to complete the report by the end of May. Even though a wealth of documentation was provided, lack of sufficient time limited the detail with which each could be studied. Time limitations also impacted on the possibilities of checking all the information and analysis with CC members. Many responses to the questionnaires were late in arriving. It was difficult to arrange interviews with some key people before the delivery of this report, though attempts will still be made to engage them in the follow-up process of internal reflection. The evaluation coincided with major negotiations in Rome involving many people from the CSM and occupying much of the time of the Secretariat. There were no resources available for the consultants to travel to Rome to meet face to face with key members of the CSM, its Secretariat and others with interests in the efficient functioning of the CSM.

While every attempt has been made in this report to provide an accurate reflection and analysis of the information provided by many people concerned with the CSM, errors of omission or misinterpretation remain the responsibility of the evaluators.

A draft version of this report was reviewed by the CSM members in the Advisory Group and informed the internal reflection process at the CC meeting in July 2014.

## Note:

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation, copies of the questionnaires sent, a selection of the documents consulted, the programme for the evaluation and follow-up process, and short biographies of the consultants are to be found in the annexes.

The consultants placed a few unattributed quotes in this report, which have come from responses to the questionnaires and interviews.

# 2 About the CSM

*"I believe that the CSM has been an incredible success since it was endorsed in October 2010 in providing a space for a diverse range of social movements and other CSOs to discuss and influence the decisions of the CFS."* 

# 2.1 Overview

The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) is the largest international mechanism of civil society organisations (CSOs) seeking to influence agriculture, food security and nutrition policies and actions - nationally, regionally and globally. Its purpose is to facilitate civil society participation in the work of the UN Committee for World Food Security (CFS), including input to negotiations, discussions, consultations and decision-making, while providing a space for dialogue between a wide-range of civil society actors. Below is a graphical representation of the structure of the CSM and the relationships between its component bodies and the CFS.<sup>2</sup>

# CSM: INTERNATIONAL FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION CIVIL SOCIETY MECHANISM FOR RELATIONS WITH CFS



Representation of the CSM, its structure and inter-relationships

In the reform process of the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in 2009, member States recognised the right of CSOs to *"autonomously establish a global mechanism for food security and nutrition which will function as a facilitating body for CSO/NGOs consultation and participation in the CFS"*<sup>3</sup>. A proposal for the establishment of the CSM, commonly called the CSM's Founding Document, was endorsed by CSOs at the Civil

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This graphic was prepared by the CSM Secretariat and was updated by the consultants, adding boxes for the Finance sub-Working Group, the CSM Forum and inclusion of the CFS Secretariat. The inter-relationships of these with other CSM bodies are not specified.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Ref: CFS:2009/2 Rev. 2

Society Consultation held in Rome in October 2010 and acknowledged by CFS Member States at CFS 36 as the way it would consult with civil society.<sup>4</sup>

The CSM is inclusive of all organisations concerned with food security and nutrition at all levels in all parts of the world. It comprises civil society and non-governmental organisations and their networks, with strong relevance to issues of food security and nutrition, and with particular attention to organisations representing peasant, small-scale and family farmers, artisanal fisherfolk, herders/pastoralists, landless, urban poor, agricultural and food workers, women, youth, consumers, Indigenous Peoples, and International NGOs whose mandates and activities are concentrated in the areas of concern to the CFS.

The CSM facilitates the participation of CSOs in the work of the CFS, including input to negotiation and decision-making in CFS Plenary Sessions, Open Ended Working Groups, Task Teams, the Advisory Group of the CFS Bureau and other CFS mechanisms, and interacts with the CFS Secretariat. The CSM also provides a space for dialogue between a wide range of civil society actors where different positions can be expressed and debated. The CSM presents common positions to the CFS where they emerge, and the range of different positions where there is no consensus. The CSM convenes a civil society forum as a preparatory event before CFS sessions. It is governed by a Coordination Committee, comprised of representatives of the constituencies and sub-regions, from which it selects four members for the Advisory Group of the CFS Bureau, aiming to achieve gender and geographic balance. It is supported by a Secretariat based in Rome. The CSM has established 11 Policy Working Groups (WGs) to develop civil society positions, through consulting with CSM members, on policy issues under discussion within the CFS and to present the views of CSOs in CFS negotiations.

# 2.2 Structures

## **Coordination Committee**

The work of the CSM is facilitated by its Coordination Committee (CC), which consists of 41 members from different constituencies and sub-regions, drawn from members in 11 constituencies and the 17 sub-regional groups. The role of CC members is to facilitate the work of CSOs within their constituencies and sub-regional groups. They perform this role by sharing information, facilitating dialogue and consultations, supporting analysis and advocacy at national and regional levels, and feeding analysis and positions into global level policy processes. The CC also oversees the work of the civil society members of the CFS Advisory Group and the Secretariat. The CC had its first formal meeting in Córdoba, Spain, in 2011.

#### CSM Members in the CFS Advisory Group

The CC selects some of its members to be members of the CFS Bureau's Advisory Group (AG). The function of the CFS AG is to provide input to the CFS Bureau, which consists of representatives from 12 member States, regarding the range of tasks which the CFS Plenary has instructed it to perform. Members of the CFS AG are drawn from UN agencies and bodies, international agricultural research institutions, international and regional financial institutions, and the private sector, as well as civil society, but decisions are made by member States. There are four places on the CFS AG for CSOs, and the CC has nominated 8 representatives to fill these places, on a rotational basis, for 2012 and 2013.

#### Finance and Administrative sub-Working Group

The CC agreed to set up a Finance and Administrative sub-Working Group of the Coordination Committee in October 2012. This was in recognition of the need to have improved oversight of the financial and administrative work of the CSM on behalf of all CSM members, given the already heavy burden on the CC and its members in the CFS AG. It consists of one suitably able person from each of the following 'regions': Africa, Asia, Latin America & Caribbean and the "rest of the world". They are identified by and from CC members. The members of the sub-Working Group should serve until the end of their mandate on the CC (i.e. up to a maximum of 2 years).

#### **CSM Policy Working Groups**

The CSM has established Policy Working Groups in order to promote dialogue and develop civil society positions, through consulting with CSM members, on policy issues within the CFS and to present the views of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> This proposal, often called the CSM Founding Document, can be found at www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/019/k9215e.pdf

CSOs in CFS negotiations, discussions, consultations and decision-making. The CSM Policy Working Groups (WGs) are open to all members of the CSM. The WGs include: Land Tenure; Agricultural Investment; Global Strategic Framework; Gender; Nutrition; Price Volatility; Protracted Crisis & Conflict; Monitoring & Accountability; Social Protection; Climate Change; Biofuels; and CFS Programme of Work. Their purpose is to enhance circulation of relevant documentation and information on the issue and on the related process in the CFS; to provide a space for dialogue and the exchange of views amongst CSOs on the issues under consideration by the CFS OEWG/TT; to provide a space for CSOs to develop strong and well-articulated civil society positions; to provide inputs to the civil society members of the CFS OEWG and TTs; and to identify civil society participants in CFS OEWGs and Task Teams and in Round Table panels. They should be coordinated by CC members and, in some cases, have technical facilitators provided by CSM member organisations.

## **Annual CSM Forum**

The Coordination Committee facilitates the organisation of a civil society meeting every year, just prior to the annual CFS session. The meeting is open to all interested civil society participants that are members of the CSM. For decision making, a balance among constituencies and regions is important. Appropriate mechanisms, including possibilities to vote when consensus is lacking, are employed. The Forum provides an important space for exchanging information, discussing priority food security and nutrition issues, identifying priorities for civil society advocacy and deliberating common positions to be taken to the annual CFS Plenary.

## **CSM Secretariat**

The CSM Secretariat provides support to members of the CSM (in particular, the CC, the Policy Working Groups, the civil society members of the AG, and the Finance and Administrative sub-Working Group) and it helps to organise the annual Civil Society Forum. The Secretariat reports to the whole of the CC. It is politically neutral and facilitates the functioning of the CSM by performing financial, logistical and communication tasks, requested by the CC. At present, the Secretariat consists of three positions—a Coordinator, Communications Officer, and Finance & Administrative Officer. It provides logistical arrangements for participation of CSM members in CFS activities and plays a critical role in monitoring CFS processes, mobilising resources, accounting for funds and communicating information on CSM and CFS activities and outcomes.

## 2.3 Finances

The CSM has, over the last three years (2011-2013) spent €1,781,497. Of this total, €1,483,914 was provided by governments, via FAO, through a Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), and €297,582 by NGOs. Annual expenditure increased by about 100% in the second year but only grew by 10% in year three to a total of €762,602. As recorded by the CSM Secretariat, the breakdown of total expenditure in Euros (€) is:

CSM Total Expenditure 2011 – 2013	TOTAL	%
Expenditure Category	3 years ( € )	
1. Participation in the CFS AG meetings	67,094	4%
2. CSM policy working groups & participation in CFS inter-sessional activities (global)	309,328	19%
3. Facilitating CSM regional, sub-regional and constituency consultations activities	402,599	25%
4. Annual CSM CC meeting, CSM Forum & participation in Annual CFS Plenary	469,236	29%
5. Secretariat	323,432	20%
6. Accountability, monitoring and contingency costs	28,798	2%
SUB TOTAL	1,599,360	
CSM Administration fee (5% on some grants)	25,004	
FAO Administration fee (7% on funds via FAO)	84,610	
FAO OPCP Managerial Cost (6% on funds via FAO)	72,523	
TOTAL	1,781,497	

#### Table 1: CSM Total Expenditure 2011 – 2013 (data provided by CSM Secretariat)

The summary of expenditure is given in Annex 3.

## CSM Evaluation - Final Report, August 2014

It is worth noting that while the funding provided to the CSM is welcome and necessary, and while it is a significant challenge to raise the funds needed to meet demands of the tasks assigned to it by the CFS, the contributions in-kind by CSM members, and especially members of the CC and the facilitators of the Policy Working Groups, in terms of their time, institutional support to individuals and un-reimbursed costs of participation, could possibly amount to an order of magnitude or more greater than the CSM's total expenditure.

# 3 Activities of CSM bodies

# 3.1 Coordination Committee

"The CC is an incredible group. The diversity, depth, talent and experience at the table is really remarkable. And one always knows that CC members are talking with a sense of purpose, that they are representing a constituency or view that needs to be heard. They are at the helm of a vitally important project of inclusive governance. But with it there is huge responsibility. If global inclusive governance is to work, we need to make this CFS model work!"

# Timeline/Context

The founding document of the CSM states that the CSM is to have a Coordination Committee (CC) *"responsible for ensuring that the functions of the CSM are carried out as effectively as possible and according to the organizing principles (of the CSM)."* The terms of reference for the CC further elaborate:

"The Committee will be responsible for facilitating the participation of CSOs in the CFS. This includes overseeing the work of the civil society members of the CFS Advisory Group and the Secretariat of the Mechanism, ensuring access to adequate funding and ensuring accountability for the finances of the Mechanism. It will also be responsible, to the best of its ability, for ensuring that there is effective two-way communication with CSM members world-wide and for supporting their efforts to participate effectively in policy dialogue at all levels....The Coordination Committee will make decisions on the functioning of the Mechanism such as: criteria for participation in the Mechanism, quotas for participation in/speaking during the CFS Plenary, selection of civil society members of the Advisory Group, providing support to the CSO Advisory Group members, and assisting in the organisation of the civil society forums related to the CFS."

Toward these ends, the CSM CC was officially formalised during its first face-to-face meeting held in Córdoba, Spain from 30 May to 1 June, 2011. In keeping with the principles of inclusion upon which the CSM was founded, the CC is comprised of 41 seats representing 11 constituencies and 17 sub-regions: 4 seats for peasant, small-scale and family farmer organisations and 2 for each of the other constituencies, and 1 from each sub-region. The breakdown of the Coordination Committee is meant to reflect priority to small-scale farmers and to ensure geographical and gender balance, with 50% of representation to be held by women. The following sub-regions and constituencies are represented on the CC, as laid out in its terms of reference:

Constituencies: peasant, small-scale and family farmers; artisanal fisherfolk; herders/pastoralists; landless; urban poor (now urban food and nutrition); agricultural and food workers; women; youth; consumers; Indigenous Peoples; and NGOs

Sub-Regions: North America; Central America and Caribbean; Andean Region; Southern Cone; Western Europe; Eastern Europe; West Asia; South Asia; South East Asia; Central Asia; Pacific; Australasia; Southern Africa, West Africa, East Africa, Central Africa, and North Africa $^{5}$ 

At the time of this first meeting, 75% of the available seats on the CC were filled. In order to be there in an official capacity, it was required for each CC member to have been selected through a consultative process within their sub-region or constituency, and that process was to be documented in writing. In addition to the newly appointed CC members, other participants included focal points (representatives of either a constituency or sub-region where a consultation process had not yet happened) and a limited number of observers and technical facilitators. One of the main focuses of this meeting was on the formation of Policy Working Groups as major vehicles through which CSM members engage in CFS processes. There was also discussion on the internal functioning of the CC. Follow-up tasks for the CC coming out of the Córdoba meeting included: 1) establishing the Policy Working Groups; 2) crafting a yearly work plan for the CSM, as well as each CC member drafting his/her individual work plan; 3) commitment to produce a lesson learning document and guidelines for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> A decision was taken at the first meeting of the CC to expand what were originally 16 sub-regions to 17, with Australasia and the Pacific recognised as two distinct sub-regions. This involved the allocation of one additional seat on the CC.

future selection processes of the CC; 4) organising the CSO Meeting in preparation for CFS 37; and 5) establishing a Rome-based Secretariat.

## **Table 2: Timeline of CSM Coordination Committee Meetings**

- 30 May 1 June, 2011, Córdoba, Spain: First Meeting of the CC
- 16 October, 2011, Rome: 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual CC Meeting prior to CFS 37 (during
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual CSM Forum, 15-16 October, 2011)
- 20 October, 2011, Rome: CC Meeting during CFS 37
- 11-12 October, 2012, Rome: 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual CC Meeting prior to CFS 39
- (followed by 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual CSM Forum, 13-14 October, 2012)
- 3-4 October, 2013, Rome: 4<sup>th</sup> Annual CC Meeting prior to CFS 40
- (followed by 4<sup>th</sup> Annual CSM Forum, 5-6 October, 2012)

#### Impacts

In the past three years since the Córdoba meetings, the CC and those supporting it have made substantial strides. These include the formation of more than 10 Policy Working Groups (see Section 3.4); the organisation of three annual CSM Forums (see Section 3.5); the selection of members to participate in the Advisory Group of the CFS and to provide some inter-sessional guidance to the CSM (see Section 3.2); and the coordination of a strong civil society presence in CFS meetings.

These accomplishments are in addition to the ongoing organising and communication work being done by many individual CC members to strengthen the linkages between the activities of their constituencies/regions and the activities of the CFS. Along these lines, CC members organised 7 sub-regional consultations throughout 2013 as a way to ensure that CFS issues were being discussed and priorities set from the sub-regional level. The outcomes of these consultations were then consolidated and brought into the Annual CSM Forum, where over 200 civil society representatives finalised policy positions and lobby strategies for the 40<sup>th</sup> Session of the CFS. Participant lists, agendas, background documents and full reports for each consultation, including regional positions on issues such as responsible agricultural investment, are available on the CSM website at www.csm4cfs.org/regional\_consultations-10/. A CSM consultation was also held by the Pastoralists' constituency during the Global Gathering of Pastoralists, Nairobi, Kenya, 9 – 15 December 2013. A report from the consultation is available here: www.csm4cfs.org/coordination\_committee-3/constituencies-4/pastoralists-5/.

#### Challenges

Three years since the inception of the CC, it is clear that the CC and those supporting it have made substantial strides, a number of which have been mentioned above. Of course, there are also other challenges yet to be overcome, which will be briefly outlined here.

**Capacity:** Individual CC members are tasked both with actively following and engaging in CFS processes (e.g., through the CSM policy working groups) and contributing to the internal functioning of the CSM, while also playing a facilitating role in their respective sub-regions/constituencies to ensure as broad civil society participation in the CFS, via the CSM, as possible. This is a large task in and of itself, further complicated by the fact that the majority of CC members are social movement leaders who have a host of commitments and obligations outside of the CSM. The fact that much of the ongoing work of the CC is done via the internet also poses a challenge to those who do not spend their days in front of a computer, and whose constituencies have limited or no internet access. Additionally, some CC members cite language barriers as a challenge to their capacity, particularly those who do not speak English, although they express appreciation for the dedicated interpretation team of the CSM.

**Roles & Responsibilities:** Lack of clarity on roles and responsibilities, both of CC members and of the different bodies of the CSM that interact with the CC, have led to a number of tensions within the CC, at times diverting time and energy away from other important tasks at hand. One important starting point in addressing this would be evisiting the original ToRs of the CC, which remain in draft form.

**CC member tenure and replacement**: The founding document of the CSM specifies that each CC member would hold his/her position for one year during the initial 2010/2011 inception period, followed by two year

periods of tenure thereafter. At the time of the Córdoba meetings, CC members were considered to be in an 'interim' capacity, subject to further discussion and evaluation at the following CC meeting, immediately prior to CFS 37 in October 2011. At that time, it was decided that the existing CC members would continue to serve their function over a two-year period, until October 2013, after which they would either be replaced or serve an additional two years maximum, following a new selection process within their sub-region/constituency. By the end of 2013, when the period of tenure of the original CC members had expired, fewer than half of the CC members had been replaced or reinstated, and the rest had not yet submitted any documentation indicating that a selection process had occurred. Unfortunately there is little formal guidance from within the CSM on carrying out effective selection processes since the document agreed upon at the Córdoba meetings that was meant to share best practices and guidelines on CC selection processes has yet to be developed. Additionally, new CC members have found it challenging to find their footing upon first entering into the CC, citing inadequate orientation.

# 3.2 Members of the CFS Advisory Group

The CSM selects people to be members of the CFS Advisory Group (AG). The function of the Advisory Group is to provide inputs to the CFS Bureau, comprising representatives from 12 member States, regarding the range of tasks which the CFS Plenary has instructed it to perform. Members of the Advisory Group are also drawn from UN agencies and bodies, international agricultural research institutions; International and regional financial institutions, and the private sector, as well as civil society, but decisions are made by member States.

## CSM membership in the CFS AG

The CFS AG retains 4 places for CSOs, selected by the CSM<sup>6</sup> respecting a balanced geographic and gender representation. Initially there were 4 *ad interim* members but once the CC was formed, it was agreed that 8 people from the CC, 75% of whom should be from social movements, would be selected by the CC for the biennium 2012-2013. The CFS Bureau was advised of the names for 2012 and for 2013. Four of these people would take the lead in the first year and four in the second, but all 8 are active in the process.

## Role of CSM members in the CFS AG

The role of the civil society members of the Advisory Group is not one of representation but rather of facilitating two-way communication between the Bureau and the CSM. The essential tasks of the civil society AG members are to share information and to present the range of views of the CSM and any common positions that CSOs may have developed. They share the agendas of upcoming Advisory Group and Bureau meetings with all members of the CSM via the website and other means of communication and solicit comments which they then communicate to the CFS Advisory Group.

## **Inter-sessional Responsibilities**

While the focus of the work is on liaising with the CFS Bureau, it is also noted in the CSM founding document that the "AG members play a key role in inter-sessional activities and would therefore help to ensure efficiency of decision-making in the Coordination Committee". This has been exercised from time to time, despite some responsibilities being passed on to the, currently inactive, Finance and Administrative sub-Working Group. Among recent activities has been the organisation and oversight of this evaluation, as requested by the CC meeting in October 2013.

## Activities of CSM members in the CFS AG

The workload is significant. The CSM members in the AG are expected to contribute substantive time and preparative work and provide advice to the CFS Bureau, based on consultations within the CSM. There are many meetings in Rome during the year. Since 2010, CSO representatives have attended and reported back to the CSM on 29 meetings of the AG: 4 meetings in 2010, 7 in 2011, 5 in 2012, 10 in 2013, and 3 so far in 2014. The meetings have covered all the work of the CFS.

The AG members have provided consistent input to CFS processes and have communicated the outcomes to the CSM through the website, emails and the CSM e-newsletters. They have been supported logistically by the Secretariat, and, technically, to the extent possible, by the Working Groups, though some would wish to provide more input. There remains a lack of clarity on: roles/responsibilities; mechanisms for consultation with Policy Working Groups (WGs) and the wider CSM in advance of meetings; and how the AG members could

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> CFS:2009/2 Rev. 2

increase the influence of the CSM by, for example, engaging more with, or facilitating others from the Working Groups to lobby, negotiators beyond the CFS bureau, such as sympathetic ambassadors in Rome, or responsible ministries in capitals. While the Secretariat provides what it can, there could be consideration of formalising further technical support, from CSM members and others, on matters beyond the remit of the Secretariat.

## Renewal of members in the AG

During the past year some individuals have passed on their role to others in the same organisation but the issue of renewal of AG members for the next biennium is pending formal agreement by the CC.

## CFS Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPOW)

AG members have also attended, with others from the CSM, many meetings of the MYPOW OEWG, usually held back-to-back with AG meetings, which have dealt specifically with decisions about the programme of work of the CFS, especially the selection of priority issues for both the CFS and the HLPE. The AG members have actively contributed to this process of selecting priorities for the MYPOW. During CFS 40, civil society expressed major concerns over the draft MYPOW, citing that the document was neither the outcome of the consensus reached during the MYPOW/OEWG process, nor based on what most regions and actors underlined as priorities. During the ranking exercise, agroecology and genetic resources ranked as high priorities and were widely supported. However this was not endorsed by the MYPOW/OEWG and was not reflected in the draft plan.

Despite the challenges, civil society's constant presence in the MYPOW/OEWG and the joint Bureau/Advisory Group meetings, and the insistence by CSM members on ensuring space for discussions on agroecology and genetic resources for food and agriculture, helped bring these issues to the forefront of the CFS. This ensured that these highly politicised topics were constantly at the centre of debate, to the point that the Chair of the CFS informally recognised their importance and proposed to start a dialogue by holding a CFS-endorsed side event on the issues. In addition to this, civil society specifically requested that the CFS continue commissioning two High Level Panel of Expert (HLPE) reports per year, in order to sustain the CFS's capacity to address key issues, as would be expected of this unique global governance body. Also, by request of the CSM, it was agreed to hold regional consultations to help define CFS priorities from the regional perspective. This supported the "bottom-up approach to defining priorities" that has been a key issue for civil society since the CFS reform.<sup>7</sup>

# 3.3 Finance sub-Working Group

The CC agreed to set up a Finance and Administrative sub-Working Group of the Coordination Committee in October 2012, recognising the need, given the already heavy burden on CC members and its members in the CFS AG, to have improved oversight of the financial and administrative work of the CSM on behalf of all CSM members.

The sub-Working Group consists of one suitably able person from each of the following 'regions': Africa, Asia, Latin America & Caribbean and the "rest of the world". They are identified by and from CC members. The members of the Sub-Working Group should serve until the end of their mandate on the CC (i.e. up to a maximum of 2 years).

The sub-Working Group was active in 2013. It 'signed off' the quarterly accounts of the CSM before circulation to the CC and it completed a process and made a proposal to the CC on how the use of CSM funds should be prioritised. Since the CC meeting in October 2013 it has not been active.

The draft Terms of Reference stipulate that the sub-Working Group will 1) Oversee the development of the overall CSM yearly budget and present it during the CSM annual CC meeting; 2) Develop and propose a mid and long term CSM funding strategy and support the mobilisation of funds from donors; 3) Make recommendations to the whole CC on the allocation of CSM funds to support the activities of constituencies, regions/sub-regions and Policy Working Groups - resources should be allocated following the criteria agreed during the CSM Coordination Committee meeting in October 2012; 4) Support the finance and administrative work of the CSM Secretariat in ensuring a the timely release of funds from the CSM Multi Donor Trust Fund that is administered

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See: CFS 2013/40/9 Rev.1, p.17, para.6

by the OPCP office in FAO; and 5) approve the CSM Annual Report for consideration by the Coordination Committee and dissemination to CSM members, donors and other relevant actors.

The whole CC should be involved in making decisions on all critical and long-term financial and administrative issues. However, for urgent and routine decisions, for which it is not possible to involve the whole CC, the sub-Working Group is to assume responsibility. Even though the sub-Working Group members are selected to ensure a geographical balance, this does not mean that they represent or communicate only with CC members from their respective regions. The sub-Working Group members are collectively responsible for consulting and communicating with all other CC members. Furthermore, when making recommendations to the whole CC on how to allocate resources, they must do so objectively, according to the criteria for allocating resources agreed by the whole Coordination Committee.

While the sub-Working Group has the, yet to be formalised, task to take responsibility for "urgent and routine decisions", it is unclear what, if any, are its formal relations inter-sessionally with the CC's members in the CFS AG, whose mandate includes playing "a key role in inter-sessional activities" in order to help to ensure efficiency of decision-making in the Coordination Committee.

# 3.4 Policy Working Groups

# "The strength of the CSM is the Working Groups and the importance of the Task Teams."

The CSM has established Policy Working Groups in order to promote dialogue and common positions amongst CSOs on issues being discussed in the CFS. They should be coordinated by CC members and, in some cases, have technical facilitators provided by CSM member organisations.

# 3.4.1 Land Tenure

## Timeline

The CSM Working Group on Land Tenure played a pivotal role in the adoption of the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (a.k.a. the Tenure Guidelines, or TGs) by the CFS, considered a landmark achievement for both the CSM and the CFS. The process surrounding the TGs started prior to the 2009 reform of the CFS and was connected to the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD) of the FAO in 2006. When the TGs came onto the agenda of the CFS, CSOs had thus already been hard at work on the process of formulating them, facilitated by the Land Group of the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC). Once under the auspices of the CFS, facilitation of civil society input into the TGs was transferred from the IPC to the CSM, with many participants remaining the same, but also new ones coming on board. The bulk of the work of this CSM Policy Working Group (WG) took place from September 2010 through October 2012, with 50 to 80 active participants at any given time. The work of the WG included in-person meetings during CSM gatherings, extensive email exchanges, frequent meetings via phone/Skype, and active, in-person participation in each of the three rounds of negotiations in Rome.

## Impact

When the TGs were adopted by the CFS in May of 2012 after three intense rounds of negotiations, the CSM was recognised by the officials who led the process for having played a critical role. The Land Tenure WG had been responsible for organising civil society participation and inputs into all three rounds of negotiations, and throughout the inter-sessional processes. In preparation for the negotiations, inter-sessional work included gathering and collating civil society input, drafting strategies for influencing the discussions, and undertaking advocacy work in key capitals prior to the negotiations, using the common messages agreed through the CSM. Before the endorsement of the TGs, the Working Group developed and circulated a joint statement and press release, undersigned by 29 international and regional networks and 21 national organisations.

#### Outcome

All in all, civil society considered the adoption of the TGs to be a major leap forward, while noting certain critical areas in which the TGs fell short. On the positive end, several key principles were recognized in the TGs, in particular the need to respect and protect human rights in the context of

tenure. Principles of implementation were clearly established, in particular respect for human dignity, non-discrimination, equity and justice, gender equality, a holistic and sustainable approach to the management of natural resources, and consultation and participation. Limitations included failure to provide a comprehensive set of rules to effectively counter widespread grabbing of natural resources; weakness in prioritizing the rights of small-scale producers and in further protecting the rights of Indigenous people, and the omission of water as a land resource.

#### Follow-up/Lessons Learned

Feedback from participants of this WG was largely positive, citing as key factors the skilled and dedicated facilitator whose organization supported her in devoting a substantial amount of time to the Working Group (resourced through non-CSM funds) and the fact that social movements had already been engaged in the TGs and thus were committed to the process. Following the adoption of the TGs, there has been a lack of consensus within the CSM as to whether the CSM should be actively engaged in the implementation phase of the TGs or whether that is beyond the scope of the CSM and better left to other bodies, such as the IPC. One positive step forward is that, thanks in large part to the efforts of the Monitoring & Accountability Working Group of the CSM, the TGs have been put forward as a pilot case for current monitoring efforts within the CFS. Therefore, while the Land Tenure Working Group of the CSM is no longer active (much of the work having been transferred back over to the IPC), the CSM is able to continue to build upon the momentum of the adoption of the TGs through the Monitoring & Accountability WG.

# 3.4.2 Agricultural Investment

## Timeline

Action by CSOs to improve CFS thinking about agricultural investment started at CFS 36 in 2010 before the WG was formally set up to contribute to the CFS 37 Round Table on "How to Increase Food Security through Smallholder-Sensitive Investment in Agriculture" and the OEWG for the development of Principles on Responsible Agricultural Investment (rai). There are over 100 members in the WG and regional and national consultations have drawn in many more. Led by social movement representatives from farmers' organisations, its work is facilitated by technical staff made available by their organisations to work on the issue, ably supported by Rome-based organisations. The WG has met at the time of CSM forums, and sub-groups have regularly met on Skype. Many papers have been produced by the WG and inputs to CFS documents and processes have been significant, including the development of the Terms of Reference of the consultation, which included the scoping process that determined the framework of the 'principles', as well as to the consultative process itself. It is an issue that has also been central to the agenda of the CFS Bureau/Advisory Group, with which the CSM members of the AG have interacted considerably on this issue. The packed 2014 schedule leads towards the adoption of the principles at CFS 41. A global meeting in May, during the evaluation process, to agree changes to the Zero Draft of the CFS paper, was attended by 40 people from the CSM.

#### Impact

In 2010 during CFS 36, the CSO delegation successfully blocked endorsement by the CFS of the "Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment that Respects Rights, Livelihoods and Resources" (RAI), which were developed by the World Bank, UNCTAD, FAO and IFAD in 2009. Thereafter, the WG first built on their proposal for the type of process the consultation should have and then focused on content towards developing principles that should lead to guidelines with sufficient safeguards to ensure investments are supportive of realising the Right to Food. The CSM successfully helped the CFS overturn its initial focus on inward investment towards a priority focus on investments by and for smallscale food producers, in the face of some governments pushing for a broader spectrum of actors in the value-chain. The CSM achieved many significant text changes including, for example, simplification of language; the inclusion of a focus on women, small-scale producers and vulnerable groups; and addressing responsibilities to ensure legal accountability, remedies and measures for reparations and compensation. The WG achieved majority support for a 2-year consultation process leading up to CFS 41. They also convinced governments that the only way to have an inclusive process without high costs was to use existing forums in 2013, such as the FAO Regional Conferences, to conduct broad consultations in preparation for the final round of negotiations. After lobbying hard with the Chair of the OEWG, CSOs had 15 seats in each of the regional consultations – 10 of which were funded by the CFS.

#### Outcome

Though some significant achievements have been realised, the negotiations are on-going and the final outcome is unknown. A problem identified in the process has been the high volume of papers produced and the short turnaround demanded by the CFS for comments on drafts. This is something that is difficult for the CSM to accommodate, as the WG coordinators and technical support team may be engaged in other activities in the regions, and consultations, particularly with small scale food producer organisations, take time.

#### Follow-up/Lessons Learned

The high-profile and time-consuming work of the WG has been made possible by the technical facilitation offered freely to the CSM by various organisations; in the medium term that is unsustainable unless specific funding support is realised. It is also noted that much more capacity building on the issues and the processes and good information exchange, in several languages, is essential for creating the necessary political momentum in different countries and regions to achieve change in the CFS itself. This requires adequate resourcing. Special efforts were needed to ensure full social movement inclusion in the process. While regional consultations happened successfully, it has been argued that there could have been a greater CSM constituency role in developing these.

## 3.4.3 Global Strategic Framework

### Timeline

The CSM played an instrumental role in the adoption of the Global Strategic Frame (GSF) of the CFS during CFS 39 and the subsequent endorsement of the Second Version of the GSF during CFS 40. The GSF is the overarching framework of the CFS and is intended to be the primary global reference for coordination and coherence in decision making on food and agricultural issues. Moreover, the GSF is meant to enhance the role of the CFS as the most inclusive platform for global, regional and country-led food security and nutrition actions. Since the reform of the CFS, the development of the GSF had been a central demand of CSOs.

The GSF Working Group of the CSM was formed in June 2010 and was active through the end of 2012. The group had over 50 members, about 15 of whom were highly involved, with substantial representation of sectors and engagement of social movements. A task team of four people, two of whom were CC members, helped to move forward the work, along with the technical facilitators. The work of the group was largely conducted via email and Skype and also included regional civil society consultations (funded by the CSM) and an active presence at each of three rounds of Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) meetings as well as during the CFS plenary in which the GSF was adopted.

#### Impact

Throughout the negotiation process, the GSF Working Group drew upon inputs from the other CSM WGs to ensure that the CSO positions on the GSF were informed by experts on the different issues and to ensure consistency and coherence with existing joint CSO positions. Through the CSM Working Group on the GSF, civil society participants were able to effectively engage in all of the OEWG meetings, and push on several key issues. Consultations on the GSF made it so far as the FAO regional conferences, which included a CFS multi-stakeholder event on the GSF, which took place from March to May 2012. The CSM was able to fund and support civil society consultations prior to each conference to further elaborate positions on the GSF from a regional perspective. Additionally, lobby meetings and discussions were held with government officials in Rome and in capitals, which allowed CSOs to continue to develop relationships with governments and other key stakeholders.

## Outcome

Upon the adoption of the GSF, the GSF WG and others within the CSM concluded that the GSF constitutes a step forward in promoting a new model of governance of food, agriculture, and nutrition. Particular civil society wins in the GSF process include the fact that it is grounded in a human rights approach that builds upon existing human rights instruments; emphasises women's rights; recognises the centrality of small-scale food providers; recognises the need for living wages for agricultural workers; mentions the potential of agroecology; and lays the framework for human rights-based monitoring and accountability. Among its weaknesses from a civil society perspective is the fact that any reference to food sovereignty was omitted from the text due to strong opposition by several governments.

#### Follow-up/Lessons Learned

Two factors identified as having contributed to the largely successful functioning of the GSF WG were that two major social movements were active in the task team and that a CSO statement on the GSF was prepared before the actual drafting process of the GSF was started within the CFS. The latter was considered fundamental for defining the political aims for the CSM's engagement with the CFS. Obstacles encountered by this group included language barriers, time and capacity limitations, and divergences in political views, which the facilitators worked to address via processes of consensus-building.

# 3.4.4 Gender

## Timeline

Formation of the CSM Working Group on "gender, food security and nutrition" was agreed in 2010 but worked mainly from July until October 2011. It subsequently split into two groups, one on gender and one on nutrition. The original WG was set up to interface with the eponymous CFS process for CFS 37. The group had a wide membership of about 40 people, including the active involvement of women's social movements and NGOs, with both nutrition and development perspectives. It was able to achieve a common understanding of the issues and prepare papers, comment on the different draft CFS documents and participate in the TT, Policy Round Tables and CFS negotiations. After CFS 37, the WG did not follow up on the CFS recommendations to bring a women's rights perspective across all the work of the CFS, though there was the proposal to mainstream gender in all the CFS processes. The WG effectively ceased operating. The active members of the WG continued however, to push women's rights and gender perspectives in other processes like the GSF and rai, to good effect.

## Impact

The CSM, through the WG, gained human rights language in the Decision Box, with the CFS recognising the crucial role of women in ensuring food and nutrition security and affirming that female smallholders should be given equal treatment in agricultural programming, both as a matter of human rights and to promote the economic development of women.

#### Outcome

The CFS urged member states to take affirmative action to ensure women's meaningful participation at all levels of decision-making processes and in the control over natural resources, including land, and to actively promote women in their efforts of collective organising. Governments were asked to audit their national legislation to amend discriminatory laws, and have to enact and enforce laws against all kinds of violence. It was recommended that agricultural investments take into account and prioritise the specific needs of women, and the principle that investments in land and other natural resources have impact on women's food security was accepted. The need for agricultural investments to be cognisant of women's and men's commitments to household economies and to child-rearing and recognising their different needs was stressed.

#### Follow-up/Lessons Learned

There was the general feeling that the "silo approach", on both the gender and nutrition issues, that was adopted in CFS 37, resulted mainly from having a policy round table focused on these issues in isolation. On the one hand, it helped raise attention of these crucial issues in the CFS; on the other hand, it limited the gender and nutrition discussion to that space instead of addressing them as cross-cutting issues across all the policy round tables to ensure that women's rights, priorities and specific needs are not marginalised or addressed in isolation. A major challenge within the WG was to engage, in a multilingual context, as much as possible with women's groups that often have less capacity to react quickly as they spend a lot of time away from good internet connections.

# 3.4.5 Nutrition

## Timeline

Nutrition had previously been included in another WG on "gender, food security and nutrition" that had been set up in 2010 but which subsequently split into two groups one on gender and one on nutrition. The CSM Working Group on Nutrition started in January 2012 to interface with the CFS Task Team (TT) on Nutrition Terminology that was responsible for developing an "options paper", for consideration at

CFS 39. The WG had up to 25 members, 10 of whom were active and four interacted with the TT. There was a reasonable regional and gender balance in the WG, but not in terms of age and constituency and with limited social movement involvement. The full WG only met during the CSM Forums of 2012 and 2013, but there were many other meetings of smaller sub-groups (face to face and by Skype) prior to CFS 38 and in preparation for a side event held in parallel to CFS 39.

#### Impact

After submissions of comments on the first draft of the terminology document, hardly any of the CSO inputs were incorporated. Most likely this was due to the fact that many of the CSO comments reflected on the importance to work from a rights-based approach and a food sovereignty perspective. These comments were said to be outside of the scope of the task force. Yet the WG achieved reference to the Right to Food in the Key Messages, although not in the Decision Box. The WG considered that a step forward but emphasised that the terminology document should not be an end in itself but should help inform the CFS in defining its role in relation to nutrition and other inter-governmental institutions working on nutrition-related issues. This message was received favourably by other members of the Task Team.

#### Outcome

The WG helped change opinion about nutrition in the CFS. It was set up in the context of the virtual absence of nutrition issues from the discussions in the CFS. The WG urged caution about focusing on specific technical or economic solutions that may ignore the social determination of malnutrition. It called for an integrated approach to tackling malnutrition and realising the right to adequate food and nutrition, and comprehensive and participatory improvements in the governance of nutrition throughout the life-cycle.

#### Follow-up/Lessons Learned

The WG benefitted from good facilitation and leadership. While it was important that 6 or 7 social movement representatives were involved after the CSM 2013, it would have been better if the WG had had more input and participation of social movements from the outset. To extend its reach, it would be helpful to add, to the existing health and child nutrition-focused organisations already represented, more people from the constituencies representing producers (agricultural workers and farmers, the landless, fisherfolk) as well as youth. To embed the issues in the CSM, members of the WG were urged to join other working groups to ensure that nutrition is adequately addressed. It is argued that the CSM needs to make nutrition more visible in its own work and to ensure nutrition is taken seriously into account in CFS proceedings.

# 3.4.6 Price Volatility

#### Timeline

The Food Price Volatility Working Group was among the earlier Policy Working Groups of the CSM, initiated in 2011 in preparation for CFS 37, in which food price volatility was a key agenda item. The group consisted of 35 members, approximately 10 of which were active. Of those active, most were from Northern NGOs, with a noted lack of participation by social movements. The bulk of the work of this WG revolved around CFS 37, and it actively engaged in each step of the process, from the HLPE report to the final negotiations. The WG also organized a side event for CFS 39 in 2012, among other activities. Most of the work of the WG was conducted via email and Skype, with face-to-face meetings during CSM gatherings.

#### Impact

After much hard work leading up to the food price volatility negotiations of CFS 37, the CSOs involved were very disappointed by their experience during the final process of negotiation, as well as the outcomes of this process. They felt that they were systematically excluded, while in principle they should have been able to participate on equal terms with the government representatives. They noted that their input (in particular, on trade and biofuels) was continuously dismissed and excluded from the text and that their views were misrepresented by the Chair. This ultimately led the CSOs to walk out of the negotiations. They drafted a statement detailing their reasons for doing so, which was read in the final plenary session of the CFS the following day.

#### Outcome

The outcomes of the food price volatility negotiations were seen by CSOs as insufficient and inadequate to address the recurrent food price crises. CSOs also felt that the opportunity to address price volatility in a coherent way was wasted, as any discussion of trade was shot down, as were any possible openings for future discussion of trade within the CFS. Furthermore, the Decision Box was re-crafted in a way that failed to adequately address the root causes that are driving price volatility, as identified by the High Level Panel of Experts and other multi-stakeholder assessments. There were, however, several outcomes that were viewed positively by CSOs, such as agreement on an improved agricultural market information system (AMIS), the mandate for an HLPE report on biofuels, and some small openings for further attention to reserves on the CFS agenda.

#### Follow-up/Lessons Learned

Beyond the fact that they were dealing with a politically fraught issue (i.e., the fact that in the eyes of civil society, food price volatility cannot be separated from issues of trade, while some powerful governments were adamant about keeping trade off the CFS agenda), the Food Price Volatility WG identified some additional barriers to success. One was the rushed time frame of the CFS, which limited the ability of social movements to engage in the process and also put the group in more of a responsive than proactive position. Another is that members of the CC had very little involvement in this WG, which hampered its ability to function at full capacity. This issue has since been addressed by ensuring that each CSM WG has a designated coordinator (or co-coordinators) from the CC.

# 3.4.7 Protracted Crisis & Conflict

#### Timeline

The work that formed the basis for the CSM Working Group on Protracted Crises began in 2003 under the auspices of the IPC, and thus a strong 7-year track record had already been established when it was transferred over to the CSM. In 2012, protracted crises were among the main issues on the CFS agenda. In preparation for CFS 39, a High Level Forum of Experts was formed by the CFS, in which the coordinator of the CSM Protracted Crises WG was an active participant. This facilitated strong CSO representation, and a strong overall role of the CSM, in negotiations on protracted crises in the CFS. Among the outcomes of CFS 39 was approval of a *"consultative process including all relevant stakeholders to elaborate an Agenda for Action for Addressing Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises"*. The Protracted Crises Working Group is deeply engaged in this process. The group has around 100 members with different levels of engagement and a technical team of 20 people that spans different regions and constituencies, although some regions are in need of greater representation.

#### Impact

Members of the CSM WG on Protracted Crises have been most active in the process of developing an Agenda for Action (through the CFS's Steering Committee, Technical Task Team, and the OEWG), and have volunteered numerous hours to be able to incorporate CSO input into the draft Agenda for Action. The WG feels that it has positively impacted the Protracted Crises process of the CFS to a great extent. During the process of developing the draft Agenda of Action, the majority of CSO demands have been endorsed by the co-Chairs and the CFS Technical Committee. These include, among others, the prioritisation of food insecure protracted crisis-affected communities and affected populations; special mention of small-scale food producers and their control over productive assets; and agreement that the Agenda for Action be directed at "all governments at all levels" and not at only those suffering from crises.

#### Outcome

The final outcomes of this process have yet to been seen since it is currently a work in progress. The Agenda for Action is currently in the drafting stage and will undergo an online consultation prior to CFS 41 (2014), when it will be proposed for adoption. Based on the process thus far, it can be anticipated that civil society will continue to play a prominent role.

## Follow-up/Lessons Learned

The Protracted Crises Working Group of the CSM prides itself as being the only CSM WG facilitated by southern affected communities with no assistance from northern NGOs. Participants have described the working atmosphere as being participatory and cordial. One challenge is that this has come at a significant expense to those who have been volunteering their time in the facilitation of the group. As

with several of the other CSM WGs, this points to a need to look at resource allocation for the functioning of the groups. Also, members of the WG would like to see greater support and engagement of additional members of the CSM on the issue of protracted crises in order to maximize the impact that the CSM is able to have on this issue.

# 3.4.8 Monitoring and Accountability

## Timeline

During CFS 39 in October 2012, the CFS mandated the establishment of an Open Ended Working Group to explore appropriate mechanisms to measure the impact of CFS decisions. In response to this, not only was an OEWG established, but also a smaller, *ad hoc* Technical Task Team to provide more detailed insights on existing monitoring mechanisms at country, regional and global levels. The Technical Task Team's inputs were meant to provide a solid basis for discussions during the OEWG meetings and workshops. Between these two bodies, civil society has been actively engaged through the CSM's Working Group on Monitoring &Accountability (originally called the Monitoring & Mapping Working Group).

The full WG met in person during the CSM Annual Forums in 2012 and 2013, and a smaller group meets around once per month via Skype. Approximately 45 members are involved. The WG is facilitated by a technical support person, in partnership with a CC member coming from a social movement. The membership of the group is relatively well-balanced, but lacking in participation of French speakers due to language limitations.

## Impact

Although Member States had agreed to establish an innovative monitoring mechanism during the reform of the CFS, advocacy by civil society played a major role in helping to move this decision forward at CFS 39, as monitoring was seen as key to ensuring that the decisions taken at the CFS actually make an impact on the ground. Following CFS 39, the CSM Monitoring & Accountability Working Group has actively participated in meetings of both the OEWG and the Technical Task Team, which are ongoing. A number of their proposals have thus far been accepted, such as recognition of the principles on monitoring and accountability laid out in the Global Strategic Framework (GSF) as guiding principles and acceptance of the Tenure Guidelines as a pilot case for CFS monitoring (although the process of moving that forward has been slower than CSOs would like). Some of the other proposals of the WG, however, have been met with greater resistance within the CFS.

## Outcome

The outcomes of this process have yet to be seen, as it is very much a work in progress, but members of the CSM, and of the WG in particular, remain committed to seeing their proposals through in order to establish an effective monitoring mechanism for the CFS that is innovative, participatory, and grounded in a human rights framework.

## Follow-up/Lessons Learned

One challenge faced by this WG has been to attract sufficient attention and interest among members of the CSM, given the connotation of monitoring as being dry and technical. However, participation of WG members has significantly improved since October 2013, as there is an increased consciousness among different WGs (TG, GSF, now also A4A and rai) that the monitoring and accountability mechanism is key to ensuring the sustainability of civil society achievements in negotiation processes. Currently, the Monitoring & Assessment WG is proposing that a broad discussion take place during the next CSM Annual Forum to assess collectively if this topic should become one of the priorities of the CSM for the CFS in the upcoming years.

# 3.4.9 Social Protection

## Timeline

The Social Protection Working Group of the CSM was active during 2012, when social protection was on the agenda of CFS 39. The group had about 10 members, 4-6 of whom were active. The work was led jointly by a CC and AG member representing the Agricultural Workers constituency and a technical support person from an NGO. There was limited involvement by other members of the CC and by social

movements in particular. The group communicated via email and Skype and was present in Rome for two CFS Task Team meetings and a 'multi-stakeholder dialogue' prior to CFS 39.

## Impact

Many of the political aims of this group were achieved. CSOs appreciated the emphasis given to social protection as a universal human right and the important role of the social protection floor in implementing this right. They commended the leadership that the CFS demonstrated in strengthening comprehensive, nationally owned, context sensitive, social protection systems guided by human rights norms and standards, in particular in relation to the progressive realisation of the right to food.

## Outcome

CSOs noted a number of achievements reflected in the Social Protection Decision Box, among them, a strong human rights perspective, including explicit reference to social protection floors; emphasis on meaningful participation of stakeholders; a strong gender perspective; special recognition of countries in protracted crises; inclusion of decent work; inclusion of the importance of policies that support breastfeeding; and specific reference to small-scale food producers in providing some social protection responses. They also noted a number of significant omissions from the text, including references to international obligations, inclusion of food reserves, and stronger wording for monitoring on social protection, among others.

## Follow-up/Lessons Learned

Key to the success of this group was the combination of strong leadership by a CC member who represented an affected constituency, as well as technical facilitation by a supportive NGO. As noted above, a weakness of the group was limited participation by other members of the CC and by social movements in particular. According to one participant, "there has been limited understanding on the longer term and strategic importance of the issue. This has been seen as a merely trade unions' issue, while it could have been seen as a powerful issue to strengthen the rights-based approach, and to build collective interests between small-scale food producers and poor (urban) consumers."

# 3.4.10 Climate Change

#### Timeline

The Climate Change Working Group was set up to interface with the CFS process on climate change for the 38th Session of the CFS. About 40 people, mainly NGOs, signed up to this working group, of which less than a dozen participated actively, though these people are still active in other initiatives of the CSM. The WG met via Skype meetings, and those members who were Rome-based met face to face and with the CFS Task Team, which based its work on the HLPE report. There were also conference calls with the WG during the Task Team meetings.

#### Impact

CSM involvement, because of the careful commentary made by the WG, resulted in a greater examination of the issue by the CFS Task Team to the extent that the CFS Bureau decided to organise a presentation of the HLPE report on climate change and open up the process for reaching consensus through a "multi-stakeholder dialogue" on the Decisions Boxes for CFS 39. Many of the points raised were included in the Decision Box.

## Outcome

The final outcome was seen as but a first step: the WG assessed that much more would be needed to make local, national and global food systems sustainable in the face of climate change. The Decision Box recognizes the urgency of actions to address the root causes of climate change and its impacts on small-scale food producers, for whom adaptation is the top priority, but there was no agreement on the need to prioritise and increase support to resilience-increasing agro-ecological approaches, for example, or on the need for an HLPE study on genetic resources, the diversity of which in the production system is essential for adaptation. In the process, governments did recognise, however, their responsibility to ensure that all their policies and actions on climate change are consistent with the Right to Food and the commitment to eradicate hunger.

#### Follow-up/Lessons Learned

It was deemed, once the CFS had agreed upon the Decision Box on Climate Change, that the WG had finished its work. While this was an unsatisfactory conclusion for some members, as the issues need to be followed up by the CFS, without greater involvement by the leading social movements in the WG's work, it was difficult to give this the necessary prioritisation.

# 3.4.11 Biofuels

## Timeline

The Biofuels Working Group was set up to work with the CFS Task Team process, following the publication of a useful HLPE report. It also successfully launched a call to wider civil society, during the Round Table discussions. Although an appeal for a broader participation of different constituencies of the CSM was made, the group remained small and NGO dominated. In part, this may have been because this issue had not been prioritised by other constituencies fearful, perhaps, that the outcome of the negotiations could have a potential negative impact on the CFS as a whole. Leadership in the negotiations and at CFS 40 was mainly by European-based NGOs: there was weak participation of social movements, before the CSM Forum, as well as at the Forum and during the CFS.

#### Impact

While the CFS globally reaffirmed that biofuels should not compromise food security, and that they had an influence on international agricultural commodity prices and could create competition with food crops, the decision text failed to translate these affirmations into firm policy recommendations addressing these issues. Instead the recommendations were very weak, aimed at exchanging information, enhancing capacity building, and supporting research and development.

Problems began during the beginning of the drafting process in the Task Team, where, under the leadership of FAO, most of the HLPE recommendations were ignored, as were those of the CSM, despite strong lobbying efforts and interventions made in plenary and during the Friends of the Rapporteur group. The CFS 40 decisions and recommendations, approved without any discussion and by acclamation, were publicly rejected by the CSM in the final plenary.

During the CFS negotiations, the round table discussion was limited to a "Friends of the Rapporteur" process, where participation was limited to English speaking participants, and dominant representation from biofuel producing countries was evident, leaving CSM members quite isolated. In addition to this, recommendations coming from the HLPE report were largely ignored.

Although unable to secure political advances, the CSM was able to substantially limit the damage, by ensuring that the recommendations did not weaken global frameworks and agreements already achieved by the CFS, by ensuring a stronger reference to the GSF, Right to Food and the TGs (but without being considered by the TT). The Biofuels WG linked effectively with the GSF WG, which, as a result, reconsidered some strategic positions regarding the automatic inclusion of the Decision Boxes in the GSF.

#### Outcome

Civil society interventions highlighted the collusion of large country delegations with the biofuel industry's interests. These wanted to avoid any action-oriented decisions and wanted to avoid negative language on the links of industrial biofuel production with food insecurity. During the negotiations, the CSM was able to consistently challenge the CFS to follow its mandate to deliver and to be consistent with its previous decisions. Despite being ignored, the CSM's role and positions were largely appreciated by a broad range of delegates, international organisations, and the CFS Secretariat.

#### Follow-up/Lessons Learned

Because of the limited involvement of social movements, there was little strategic guidance from the main constituencies during the negotiations. This could have been, in part, because the work was done hurriedly in response to the CFS's agenda, a reason for the CSM to take careful strategic decisions about priorities well in advance, looking at the upcoming CFS agenda.

# 3.5 Annual CSM Forum

The Annual Forums of CSOs prior to CFS meetings are important opportunities for information exchange, discussion of priority issues and consolidation of lobbying positions among a wide group of CSOs. The formalisation of the Annual Forum was an outcome of the CFS renewal process.

**In 2009,** the successful and effective CSO lobby at the High-Level Meeting on Food Security (RANSA) in Madrid in January 2009, facilitated in particular by the IPC, Oxfam and Action Aid, was followed by active engagement in the CFS renewal process throughout 2009, helping in the preparation of the CFS Reform Document. Immediately before CFS 35, FAO's High-Level Expert Forum was held, to which many CSOs active in the CFS were invited, allowing them to meet informally to finalise positions for the CFS Plenary. As anticipated, CFS 35 approved the CFS reform document. This requested CSOs *"to autonomously establish a global mechanism for food security and nutrition which will function as a facilitating body for CSO/NGOs consultation and participation in the CFS"*. It specifically asked CSOs to: exchange information, analysis and experience; develop common positions as appropriate; communicate to the CFS and, as appropriate, its Bureau through representatives designated by an internal self-selection process within each civil society category; and convene a civil society forum as a preparatory event before CFS sessions if so decided by the civil society mechanism. Following this request by the CFS, the same CSOs facilitated the consultative process to prepare the CSM Founding Document and the 2010 CSO forum.

**At the 2010 Forum,** held before CFS 36, 100 seats were allocated through a quota system to constituencies and regions. Non-voting observers also attended. The Forum adopted the CSM founding document, approved the formation of the CC, nominated members to attend meetings of the CFS AG, and set up Working Groups. The Forum also agreed that the 4 *ad interim* AG members, with support from the IPC Secretariat, must draft Terms of Reference, advertise the post, conduct interviews and appoint the Rome-based Secretariat. It also prepared for CFS 36, and agreed who should fill the 5 speaking slots for each agenda item in the CFS Plenary.

The CC has helped facilitate Annual Forums in the last three years, as agreed in the CSM Founding Document. These Forums have been organised in conjunction with meetings of the CC.

At the 2011 Forum, 150 Civil Society Organisations prepared for CFS 37, dividing into Working Groups to discuss the key issues and agree to positions and speakers for each agenda item in the CFS Plenary. The Forum also urged that the momentum of the CSM continues and that CC members should take a leading role in facilitating the WGs, with the support of resource people. The Forum agreed that: the tenure of the current Coordination Committee members should be extended for two years until 2013; the current interim Secretariat remain in place until a transparent and open recruitment process could take place between Dec 2011 and April 2012; and that eight names for the CFS Advisory Group would be chosen, and serve on a rotational basis for the following two years based on their time availability and in accordance to the agenda items. For administrative purposes, only 4 names would be communicated to the CFS Secretariat per year.

At the 2012 Forum over 150 civil society organisations and social movements gathered in Rome in preparation for CFS 39. Plenary sessions focused on introducing new-coming civil society participants to the ways of working within the CFS and CSM, provided an introduction to the agenda of CFS 39, and presented the CC's Annual Report. After briefings by the CSM WG coordinators, the Forum split into WGs for detailed discussions about the issues in preparation for the CFS. The reflection of CSOs after CFS 39 was that many of the points emphasised by CSOs were addressed by the CFS. CSOs particularly welcomed the decision to assess the implementation of the Right to Food Guidelines in the CFS 41 in 2014, ten years after the Guidelines were adopted.

**At the 2013 Forum** more than 200 people actively participated, indicative of the increased interest in the CFS. The CC presented its Annual Report and CSM WG coordinators briefed on the policy issues on the CFS 40 agenda, highlighting what was at stake, and what were the controversial issues. The Forum had been prepared by an *ad hoc* organising committee comprising members of the CC and three members of the AG, supported by the Secretariat. Participants in the Forum were divided into three categories: Voting participants - reserved for CC members; Non-voting delegates; and Observers. The Forum was intended not only to work on preparations for CFS 40, but also to consider the role, organising principles and functioning of the CSM; how to enhance participation and involvement of social movements in the CSM and CFS processes; and a review of the functioning of the CSM during 2010/11 in order to learn lessons to improve functioning in the future. In the

event, less emphasis was put on these points in formal sessions, but the CC concluded that they did indeed wish to address these issues and initiated the process for this evaluation.

# 3.6 Secretariat

#### **Timeline/Context**

In the Founding Document of the CSM, the CSM Secretariat is tasked with providing support to members of the CSM, the Coordination Committee, and civil society members of the Advisory Group and to help organise the annual Civil Society Forum. The Secretariat reports to the whole of the CC and is politically neutral. It plays a critical role in monitoring CFS processes, mobilising resources, accounting for funds and communicating information on CSM and CFS activities and outcomes.

At the inception of the CSM in 2010-2011, an interim Secretariat including a Coordinator, Communications Officer, and Financial & Administrative Officer was formed on an ad-hoc basis, comprised of members of two of the organizations that had been deeply involved in the founding of the CSM, Oxfam and the IPC. At the second in-person meeting of the newly formed CC in October 2011, the CC agreed upon a selection process for the permanent Secretariat to be carried out in 2012 and supported the interim Secretariat to continue its duties in the meantime. In July 2012, the positions were offered to, and accepted by, the three members of the interim Secretariat. At the end of 2013, the Coordinator of the Secretariat stepped down. The CC has since then initiated a selection process to fill this position, still to be completed at the time of finalizing this evaluation report.

#### Impacts

Since the inception of the CSM, the Secretariat has worked in a variety of ways to try to meet the needs of the CSM as it has grown and developed. For the past three years, it has worked with the CC to host the annual CSM Forum, which has attracted increasing interest within civil society and greater numbers of participants each year. It has played a key logistical role in helping CC members and other civil society representatives come to Rome and engage in CFS processes, including meetings of the AG. It has provided support to each of the Policy Working Groups (WGs) of the CSM, which has been cited as key by a number of WG facilitators. It has collaborated with and provided ongoing support to both the members of the Advisory Group as well as to the Finance and Administrative sub-Working Group. It has played an important role in the communications work of the CSM, launching a new interactive website, that is fully functional in all three languages that is a tremendous repository of information relevant to the CSM, and sending out regular CSM e-updates, among other communications functions. It has kept financial accounts of the complex funding streams, reporting regularly to the Finance and Administrative sub-Working Group (formed only in 2012), the CC, and donors, including FAO and NGOs. It has been responsible for producing the annual report of the CSM as well as for liaising with donors to raise funds for the CSM. It has coordinated with the interpretation team to ensure translation of CSM documents and interpretation at CSM meetings and events. And it has performed a wide variety of additional duties to help keep the CSM functioning.

#### Challenges

A challenge facing the Secretariat is that the internal structure and functioning of the CSM are an evolving work in progress. Thus, while it is clear in the ToRs of the Secretariat that it should implement decisions taken by the CC, it is often not clear what, in detail, has to be done, resulting on occasions in potentially conflicting requests being made of the Secretariat by different members of the CC. This can make it difficult for the Secretariat to ensure that they neither overstep their roles nor fall short of fulfilling them.

Another challenge facing the Secretariat is that as the CSM since its inception has not sought legal status or a single fiscal sponsor, because it needs to ensure it remains a facilitating mechanism and not to be seen as an NGO in its own right. The downside of this is that, in order for the CSM to operate, it needs the financial/administrative support of different NGOs that sign the contracts with donors, and receive funds on behalf of the CSM. This includes government funds that are provided to the CSM via a Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), administered by FAO, and are then routed through NGOs. The situation of multi-donor funding via NGOs creates the necessity for the capacity to handle complex accounting procedures tailored to the needs and requirements of different NGOs providing or administering CSM funds, including following fiscal laws of different countries. Every contract with the funds drawn down from the MDTF also requires detailed reporting, according to FAO rules. Getting it right is a mutual concern of donors, intermediary bodies, the CC and the Secretariat: future funding possibilities are clearly related closely to reporting on current expenditure.

# 4 Conclusions

# "The CSM has given the CFS credibility."

Based on the analysis presented above, the following preliminary conclusions are offered, focusing on 1) the ability of the CSM to effectively engage with the CFS; 2) the outreach capacity of the CSM; 3) the internal functioning of the CSM; and 4) capacity constraints and needs of the CSM.

# 4.1 Engagement with the CFS

Civil Society has enriched the outreach, functioning and quality of debate in the CFS, now the most important, and most inclusive, forum for the global governance of food and nutrition issues. Coming out of the reforms of the CFS in which CSOs played a major role, the autonomous and self-organising CSM has enabled civil society to make some major inroads in engagement with the CFS, since its renewal in 2009. CSOs actively engage in the plenary sessions, 'Friends of Rapporteur' negotiations, round tables and other processes of the CFS, with speakers able to take the floor on an equal footing basis. Inter-sessionally, the main vehicles for engagement have been the Policy Working Groups, which link with the CFS Task Teams and Open Ended Working Groups, and participation in the Advisory Group of the CFS Bureau.

The CSM has constantly pushed the focus of the CFS back to the root causes of hunger and malnutrition, the need to give priority attention to the women and men small-scale producers, who provide the food for most people in the world, and the resources they need to continue production in socially and environmentally sustainable ways; and to ensure that the CFS contributes towards the realisation of the Right to Food. The CSM's contributions have yielded tangible outcomes in the major thematic areas on the CFS agenda, albeit to varying degrees. This is evident, at times, in agreed language in Decision Boxes and accompanying text, improvements in awareness of negotiators, and in historic outputs of the CFS, such as the internationally recognised Tenure Guidelines (TGs).

Having the necessary leadership by social movements and/or impacted constituencies in the CSM's Policy Working Groups (WGs) continues to be expressed as a challenge. It may limit their work because the WGs lack the strategic political guidance and engagement required in preparation for, and during, negotiation processes. The renewed commitment by the CC to nominate one or more members, particularly from social movements, as coordinator(s) of each WG is a step forward in ensuring that there is political leadership. Additionally, successful functioning of the WGs appears to be enhanced by having experienced technical facilitation to back up the leadership and give guidance to the WGs. The best scenario seems to be when there is strong synergy and trust between the technical facilitation and the CC member(s) responsible for the WG, in concert with social movements and/or impacted constituencies. This combination has sometimes been difficult to achieve when the CC coordinators, who may also be grassroots leaders and have other responsibilities, have limited time for engaging with the WGs and they may also have limited internet access. But this challenge can be mitigated if the technical facilitators, backed by their respective organisations, have enough time and resources to provide the support that the leadership and the WGs require.

Also helpful to the success of the WGs is when they have had a proactive as opposed to a reactive approach to their engagement with the CFS. Several of the WGs were outgrowths of previously existing civil society processes, for example of the IPC, and this helped CSM participants to engage more effectively in related CFS processes. Similarly, several of the WGs were able to start off by drafting their own bold visions and proposals before entering into CFS processes, which helped to unite the group around a common vision and better equip it for effective CFS engagement. Conversely, at times when the CFS has called for feedback at short notice, or has otherwise tried to push forward processes at a pace that has not allowed for sufficient time for civil society consultations and input, the WGs have been forced into a reactive position which has limited their impact.

Another important way in which the CSM engages with the CFS is via participation in the Advisory Group of the CFS Bureau, enabling civil society to have direct input into CFS processes as they unfold inter-sessionally. Some within the CSM would like to see the CSM members of the AG liaise more closely with the Policy Working Groups (although others feel they already are). There is also interest in having the CSM members of the AG deepen their efforts to facilitate engagement with potential government and institutional allies, as some WGs already do, in order to increase the political acceptance of CSM proposals by the CFS. This is especially the case

when it comes to particularly contentious issues in which civil society on its own is unlikely to make significant inroads without strong support from within the CFS.

A further challenge to the functioning of the CSM is to limit unplanned workloads in response to the CFS's agenda. To address this, the CC could give higher priority to making a careful inventory of upcoming issues on the CFS agenda and plan strategically how best for the CSM to engage. Moreover, the CC could initiate bolder collective processes among CSOs, beyond the current agenda of the CFS, in order to influence the agenda in the future.

Main conclusions:

- In order to impact the agenda of the CFS, it is helpful when the CC and the CSM Policy Working Groups are able to take a proactive, as opposed to reactive, approach.
- It has proven especially effective, although time consuming and resource intensive, when there is sufficient, experienced technical facilitation to back up the leadership and give guidance to the Policy Working Groups (WGs), and strong engagement by the WGs with the CC, working in concert with social movements and impacted communities in the wider CSM.
- There is interest in tasking the CSM members of the CFS AG with facilitating deeper alliances within the CFS to improve the political relevancy of CSM proposals in the CFS and their subsequent adoption.

# 4.2 Outreach

Over the course of three years, the CSM has managed to expand the network of CSOs that are connected to it, as evidenced by increasing numbers of participants in the Annual CSM Forums and subscribers to the email list of the CSM, and the growing number of people engaged in CSM Policy Working Groups, some of whose mailing lists are now over 100 people. To help facilitate CSM outreach and communication, the CSM website, which is kept up to date by the Secretariat, has been improved to ensure better access to the wealth of information relevant to the CSM. The role of the Secretariat in communicating not only with CSOs, which are not in the CSM, but also to the media and the wider public, is not clear. In this and related communications tasks, more CC guidance has been identified as needed.

As interest in the CSM continues to grow, it will be important to continue to improve upon the CSM's mechanisms of outreach and communication. For instance, some CSM members who are not in the CC express sometimes feeling out of the loop on decisions being taken by the CC and other bodies in the CSM. They would appreciate even more updates on some issues through the website, and from CC members directly through the communications channels that should be linking CC members with their constituencies and sub-regions.

The CSM took a major step forward in 2013 through resourcing CSM consultations in seven different subregions. Some members of the CC expressed that these consultations were an invaluable way of raising levels of awareness of and involvement in the CFS, and the issues it addresses, among CSOs in their regions. At the same time, a challenge associated with these consultations is for there to be greater partnership between constituency and regional representatives on the CC, which could help to increase communication, improve transparency in decision making and ensure better participation in the CSM.

Another challenge related to outreach is the limited capacity of CC members. They are tasked with simultaneously engaging in the thematic work areas of the CFS, contributing to the internal development of the CSM and serving in a facilitating and organising role to connect their constituencies/sub-regions to CFS processes. The latter is a particularly time-consuming task when they are reaching out to social movements and affected communities, including those with limited or no internet access. This is an enormous scope of work that risks being overwhelmed by the urgency of CFS processes and the internal CSM agenda with their time-bound tasks. It could be helpful for the CC to have a frank discussion about this and think of ways in which outreach capacity could be strengthened, for instance, each CC member having a designated partner in his/her sub-region/constituency who is focused on outreach.

Main conclusions:

 As interest in the CSM grows, it will be important to strengthen awareness raising and communication mechanisms, using both electronic and other methods, to inform a wider range of people, to bring in new CSM members and to keep current members sufficiently connected with CSM processes. Improved guidance by CC members to the Secretariat could improve efficiencies.

- Since capacity limitations of CC members can hamper their ability to fully perform their outreach obligations, it could be helpful for them to share this task with others in their respective sub-regions/constituencies.
- Greater collaboration and communication between sub-region and constituency representatives in the CC could improve both transparency and participation in the CSM at all levels.

# 4.3 Internal Organisation

It bears recognition that the very establishment and functioning of the CSM, as the largest international mechanism of CSOs seeking to influence agriculture, food security and nutrition policies and actions from the ground level to the global level, are achievements in and of themselves. In three years, the CSM has managed to: establish a Coordination Committee comprised of the major constituencies concerned with the Right to Food and Food Sovereignty, as well as most of the major sub-regions of the world; select civil society representatives on the CFS Advisory Group, each year; organise more than 10 Policy Working Groups; and establish a permanent secretariat. That said, there are a number of growing pains, particularly related to the internal organisation of the CSM, which will be important to address in order for it to function to its full potential.

First, there is the need to review and reaffirm the roles and responsibilities of the various bodies of the CSM and of the individuals who participate in them. Second, there is the need to address current gaps in the functioning of the CSM.

A recurring theme within the evaluation process was the expressed need to review the roles and responsibilities of the members of the CC and ensure accountabilities are in place. There would appear to be an unequal contribution by CC members to the functioning of the CSM. This could be due, in part, to capacity issues (see next section), and possibly due to a lack of clarity on the full scope of roles and responsibilities involved. Although draft ToRs exist for the CC, and some say they already need updating, there is a general sense that the content and purpose of these could be better internalised by the CC. Another related issue is ambiguity around selection processes of CC members. This is particularly important to clarify at the moment, as the terms of the original CC members expired in October 2013. Fewer than half have undergone formal processes to identify a replacement or have their tenure renewed. This contributes to concerns both among CC members and by non-CC members of the CSM regarding representation in the CC.

One challenge to addressing the above concerns is that little guidance is formally available as to how to run a selection process, and there is a lack of clarity as to how vacant seats on the CC are to be filled. It could, however, be helpful to refer back to the CSM Founding Document, which suggests that "each constituency/sub-region might establish a council of focal points representing the major organisations/networks in that constituency/sub-region and that members of this council might sit on the Coordination Committee in rotation for a period of 2 years each." The CSM Founding Document continues with the requirement that "The process of Coordination Committee member selection and outcomes will be documented and made available to all CSOs and others."

There is also a need to review and come to agreement on the draft ToRs for the CSM representatives serving on the CFS Advisory Group, whose main function is to liaise with the CFS and communicate with the wider CSM but has also increasingly been called on to carry out other tasks inter-sessionally. Many CC members recognise the need to articulate better this function of the CSM members of the AG, mandated to them in the Founding Document. Others feel that their function should be limited to liaising with the CFS Bureau through the Advisory Group and that the CC should find other ways of dealing with other urgent issues. The Finance and Administrative sub-Working Group was set up, in part, in recognition of this dilemma of how to deal with urgent logistical issues, but the relationships of this sub-group with the members of the AG and the Secretariat are unclear, and for various reasons, partly due to the absence of a Coordinator, it has become inactive in recent months.

Documentation from the early days of the CSM emphasises an evolving process that would need ongoing evaluation and refinement. Three years into its progression, amidst the many strides that the CSM has made, one concern is that some of these more evaluative and reflective processes intended to be built into the CC, and the broader CSM, have taken somewhat of a backseat to other priorities. If not addressed, however, this could ultimately undermine the efficacy of the CSM. It is therefore quite timely that the CSM has embarked

upon this evaluation and process of internal reflection. It could help towards clarifying uncertainties and frictions around roles, responsibilities, accountabilities and renewal.

Enabling clear decision making on all these issues is a challenge for the CC, especially when the urgency in its face-to-face meetings is to prepare positions for the CFS plenaries and organise the CSM Annual Forums. Further, in a group of more than 40 members, with additional observers on occasions, it may be difficult to facilitate the discussion effectively, especially as the chairs are usually nominated from among the CC and have important contributions to make in their own right. Thought should be given to having occasional face-to-face meetings at less pressured times of year, using skilled and impartial facilitators to help improve decision making.

## Main Conclusions:

- The CSM Founding Document and ToRs for each body within the CSM could be revisited by the CC in order to clarify expectations, roles, responsibilities and accountabilities.
- The process for renewal and selection of CC members could be revisited, including the appointment of new CC representatives or the re-selection of current ones.
- Similarly, the process for the nomination of members of the CFS AG, for the next two-year cycle of the CC, could be revisited, with improved clarity about their additional roles, responsibilities and accountabilities.
- Possibilities for broadening leadership within CC constituencies and sub-regions could be explored, drawing from the CSM Founding Document.
- Increased support for constituency and sub-regional consultations, and improved communications and capacities, could strengthen the internal organisation of the CSM from the grassroots to global levels.

# 4.4 Capacity development

Attempting to live up to the ambitious mandate of the CSM requires a tremendous amount of work by all parties involved. As a number of those active in the CSM have indicated, feeling unequally overstretched and/or feeling that their efforts were not being recognised by others reduces motivation. This makes it important to look at capacity constraints and workloads within the CSM. For CC members, an inherent challenge identified by a number of respondents in the evaluation process is the pressures of the CC itself; their duties have ended up far exceeding the already substantial agenda that many had originally committed to. Most CC members are, unsurprisingly, high-level leaders of their respective movements/networks who are often already stretched beyond capacity in their work outside of the CC. While there is a clear political importance to their presence in the CC, it bears the question of whether it is practical to expect that they will also be able to devote sufficient time to organising and facilitating CSM-related processes in their respective constituencies / sub-regions, as well as participate in the Rome-based processes. While barriers to participation of current CC members bear addressing, and it may be worth reflecting on how realistic their current mandates and workloads are, it is also important, as new CC members come on board, that they are clear about their obligations and in a position to carry them out.

Also due to time constraints, among other barriers (e.g., limited internet access), it can be challenging for CC members and other grassroots participants involved in the CSM to follow and keep up with the ongoing work of the CFS. Support in the form of briefing documents and briefing/training or capacity building sessions can therefore be important. Language remains an ongoing capacity challenge for the CSM and its Secretariat, pointing to additional resources and strategising needed to enable CC members and grassroots members of the CSM to participate effectively. For the majority of non-English speakers, full engagement in CSM and CFS activities remains a challenge, despite the significant contribution by the team of interpreters/translators of the CSM, whose efforts are praised by everyone. Particular challenges include the CFS not providing translations of certain documents and most CSM working groups conducting the majority of their collective document editing in English, subsequently translated into French and Spanish. Furthermore, some CC members have expressed that having CSM documents available in additional languages (beyond Spanish, French, and English) would help to facilitate their work, increase participation by non-English speakers and improve awareness of the issues covered by the CFS.

Another important capacity issue concerns the technical facilitation in CSM Policy Working Groups and in the other activities of the CSM. A number of CSM participants have expressed that the Working Groups, deemed critical to the ability of the CSM to effectively engage in CFS processes, would not have been able to do so

effectively if it weren't for the efforts on the part of the technical facilitators, who invest much of their own time in the process. This significant time commitment may not be sustainable in the long-term and runs the risk of technical facilitators withdrawing and/or their organisations limiting further engagement. This support by technical facilitators is not resourced through the CSM, yet is critical to its operation.

Staff in the CSM Secretariat also face significant challenges to their capacity, exacerbated by the current vacancy in the Coordinator role, to provide logistical support to the CSM. One issue raised is the increased bureaucratic and administrative processes required because the CSM lacks a formal legal structure and/or a single fiscal sponsor for the Secretariat, to facilitate efficient administration. Another challenge is ambiguous, or absence of, decisions by the CC. The CC has taken a step to address this by setting up a Finance and Administrative sub-Working Group, but this needs increased capacity to undertake the tasks identified in its draft ToRs and thereby help the Secretariat identify priorities.

Main Conclusions:

- Capacity constraints facing CC members point to a need for dialogue and strategising on how they can be further supported in carrying out their work (and on how realistic their current mandates and workloads are), especially to ensure that often overstretched social movement leaders can play their indispensable political role.
- It could be helpful to review the ToRs for both the CC members of the AG and of the Finance and Administrative sub-Working Group in light of current capacity constraints and needs.
- Given the critical role of technical facilitators in most CSM Policy Working Groups, the question of how to manage and resource this work in a transparent way could bear further discussion.
- Addressing the issue of strengthening the decision-making processes of CC would be helpful in reducing capacity constraints faced by the CSM Secretariat.
- Language remains an ongoing capacity challenge for the CSM, pointing to additional resources and strategising needed to enable full participation by non-English speakers and increase awareness of the issues covered by the CFS.

# 4.5 Final Remarks

The CSM is clearly an important mechanism for inclusion of civil society in the global governance of food security and nutrition, and it is effective. Documentation from the early days of the CSM emphasises, however, an evolving process that would need ongoing evaluation and refinement. Three years into its progression, amidst the many strides that the CSM has made, one concern is that some of these more evaluative and reflective processes intended to be built into the CSM have taken somewhat of a backseat to other, more seemingly urgent and time-bound, priorities. If not addressed, however, this could ultimately undermine the efficacy of the CSM. It is therefore quite timely that the CSM has embarked upon this evaluation and process of internal reflection. The CSM has an important future in ensuring the CFS delivers the leadership expected.

"Through the CSM we are planting trees for the next generation."

# **5** Annexes

# Annex 1: Selected Bibliography of CSM Documents 2009 – 2013

### 2009

CFS Reform Document: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/2/cfs\_reform\_doc.pdf</u>

### 2010

- CSM Founding Document (approved at 1<sup>st</sup> Annual CSM Forum): <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/1/csm\_proposal\_en.pdf</u>
- Report of the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual CSM Forum: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/78/cso\_final\_report\_en.pdf</u>
  - CSM constituency working group conclusions: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/78/constituency wg notes en fr es.pdf</u>
  - CSM sub-regional working group conclusions: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/78/sub\_regional\_working\_group\_notes\_en\_fr\_es.</u> pdf
- CSO Messages for the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the CFS:
  - Land Tenure: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/29/cso\_messages\_on\_land\_tenure\_en.pdf</u>
     Protracted Crises:
  - http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/29/cso messages on protracted crisis en.pdf
  - GSF: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/29/gsf\_wk\_conclusions\_final.pdf</u>
  - Vulnerability: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/78/vulnerability\_working\_group\_conclusions\_en.</u> <u>pdf</u>

### **2011**

- Report of the 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Coordination Committee (Córdoba): <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/32/summary report first meeting of the cc 30 may 1</u> june 2011 en.pdf
- Voluntary Guidelines Negotiations (July & October):
  - CSO comments on 1<sup>st</sup> draft of VGGTs:
  - <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/2/cso\_consolidated\_comments\_on\_first\_draft\_en.pdf</u>
    CSO negotiating positions:
  - <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/2/cso\_negotiating\_positions\_july\_2011\_en.pdf</u>
    CSO lobby note on controversial issues:
  - <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/2/cso\_lobby\_note\_on\_controversial\_issues\_vgs\_en.pdf</u>
    CSO press release for 2<sup>nd</sup> round of negotiations:
  - <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/2/cso\_press\_release\_for\_october\_negotiations\_en.pdf</u>
    CSO evaluation on 2<sup>nd</sup> round of negotiations:
  - http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/2/cso\_debriefing\_of\_october\_negotiations\_en.pdf
- Report of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual CSM Forum: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/79/summary\_report\_csm\_forum\_2011\_en.pdf</u>
- Report of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Coordination Committee Meeting: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/32/summary report ag cc meetings october2011 en.pdf</u>
  - Proposal for AG selection: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/79/proposal for ag selection en.pdf</u>
  - Tenure for Coordination Committee: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/79/decision box tenure of coordination commi</u> <u>ttee members en.pdf</u>

- CSO Messages for the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the CFS:
  - Food Price Volatility: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/30/cso\_37\_messages\_on\_fpv\_en.pdf</u>
    - Smallholder-Sensitive Agricultural Investment: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/30/cso\_37\_messages\_on\_ag.investment\_en.pdf</u>
    - Gender, Food Security & Nutrition: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/30/cso\_37\_messages\_on\_gender\_en.pdf</u>
    - CSO Assessment on CFS 37 Agricultural investment roundtable: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/30/cso 37 assessment ag. investment en.pdf</u>
       CSO Assessment on CFS 37 FPV roundtable:
    - CSO Assessment on CFS 37 TV Foundable.
      <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/30/cso\_37\_assessment\_fpv\_en.pdf</u>
      CSO Assessment on CFS 37 Gender roundtable:
    - http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/30/cso 37 assessment on gender en.pdf

#### Global Strategic Framework:

- May 2011 CSO compiled comments on GSF Annotated Outline: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/39/cso compiled comments on gsf annotated outline</u> <u>may 2011 en.pdf</u>
- Dec 2011 Civil society working document on the Global Strategic Framework: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/41/cso\_working\_document\_on\_the\_gsf\_december\_2011\_en.pdf</u>

#### 2012

CSM Annual Report: http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/News/112/csm annual report 2012.pdf

#### Voluntary Guidelines Negotiations & Endorsement (March & May)

- CSO lobby note: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/2/cso lobby note on controversial issues march en.pdf</u>
- Joint CSO political statement: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/3/final\_political\_statement\_20120504\_en(1).pdf</u>
- o Joint CSO press release: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/3/joint\_press\_release2\_en.pdf</u>

#### **Global Strategic Framework**

- Compiled contributions from CSO regional consultations on GSF 1<sup>st</sup> Draft: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/45/contributions from cso consultations to the gsf firs</u> <u>t draft final.pdf</u>
- CSO strategy and workplan for GSF process:
  <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/45/civil\_society\_strategy\_for\_gsf\_draft\_(1)\_en.pdf</u>
- CSO summary assessment of GSF 1<sup>st</sup> Draft: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/45/summary assessment of gsf first draft from a civil</u> <u>society perspective final (3).pdf</u>
- Key remarks to Governments on GSF: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/45/key\_csos\_remarks\_to\_governments\_on\_gsf.pdf</u>
- CSO summary assessment of GSF 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/50/summary assessment of gsf 2nd en.pdf</u>
- FINAL CSO summary assessment of the GSF First Version: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/52/gsf final assessment civil society perspective mwb</u> <u>ava en.pdf</u>

### Agenda 4 Action

- CSO Input to HLEF draft outcomes paper: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/51/hlef\_outcomes\_paper\_csm\_input\_(2).pdf</u>
- CSO Messages during High Level Expert Forum: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/51/cso\_hlef\_interventions\_en.pdf</u>

rai

- CSO Key messages for July OEWG meeting: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/61/key messages for rai meeting 25 july.pdf</u>
- CSO Proposal for rai Annotated Outline: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/67/csm\_rai\_2012\_11\_20cfs\_texao.pdf</u>

#### Monitoring

- CSO key messages for June OEWG meeting: http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/13/civil society contributions for the monitoring open e nded working group on 21st of june.pdf
- Report of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Coordination Committee Meeting: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/32/en\_report\_2012\_csm\_cc\_meeting.pdf</u>
   SUMMARY report of the CC meeting:
  - SUMMARY report of the CC meeting: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/32/en\_summary\_report\_2012\_csm\_cc\_meeting\_</u> report.pdf
- Report of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual CSM Forum: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/80/csm\_forum\_2012\_report\_en.pdf</u>
  - Guidelines for CSO participation in Forum and CFS Plenary: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/80/guidelines for cso participation in the cfs a</u> <u>nd csm.pdf</u>
- CSO Messages for the 39<sup>th</sup> Session of the CFS:
  - Social protection: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/47/social protection intervention.pdf</u>
     Climate change:
  - http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/47/climate\_change\_opening\_statement.pdf
  - o rai: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/47/plenaryinterventionrai.pdf</u>
  - Nutrition terminology: http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/47/nutrition speaking points final en.pdf
  - GSF: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/47/gsf\_joint\_statement\_csm\_en\_revised.pdf</u>
    Emerging Issues:
  - http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/47/proposal\_emergingissuesprocess\_enesfr.pdf
    Protracted Crises:
    - http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/47/protracted crises interventions cfs 39.pdf
- Climate Change lobby note:
  <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/15/csos\_lobbying\_note\_on\_climate\_change\_cfs2012\_en.pdf</u>
- CSO After Action Review of CFS 39: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/47/cso\_after\_action\_review\_of\_cfs\_39.pdf</u>
- CSO Evaluation of CFS 39 policy outcomes: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/47/civil society evaluation of cfs 39 6 nov clean en.pd</u> <u>f</u>

### 2013

### MYPOW

- Agroecology: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/82/1 de abril propuesta agroecologia en el csa en.pdf</u>
   Genetic resources:
- http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/82/mypow\_explanation\_grfaupdate.pdf

 Food sovereignty: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/82/es\_cfs\_oewg\_pwp\_proposed\_topics\_explanation\_shee\_t\_lvc\_sob\_alim\_def(1).pdf</u>

### Monitoring

- CSO contribution to draft issue paper: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/77/cso\_contributions\_on\_draft\_issue\_paper\_on\_monitori\_ng\_january\_24.pdf</u>
- CSO messages on draft monitoring matrix: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/88/cs\_comments\_on\_cfs\_monitoring\_matrix\_and\_existing\_monitoring\_mechanism.pdf</u>
- CSO messages for May OEWG meeting: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/91/civil\_society\_contributions\_to\_the\_oewg.pdf</u>
- CSO inputs to workshop questions: http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/95/cso\_inputs\_to\_july\_18\_workshop.pdf

### rai

- Compiled CSO assessment of revised Annotated Outline: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/75/compiled cs com revised annotated outline jan 15</u> <u>2013 en.pdf</u>
- CSO Annotated Outline: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/90/2013 03 21 civil society draft annotated outline en</u> <u>.pdf</u>
- Key CSO points for New rai zero draft: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/90/key\_civil\_society\_points\_for\_rai\_zero\_draft\_lc.pdf</u>
- CSO comments on pre-draft of the New Zero Draft: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/94/cs comments on new rai zero draft june 7 2013 e</u> <u>n.pdf</u>
- Compiled CSO comments on New Zero Draft: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/94/cs\_comments\_new\_zero\_draft\_july\_18\_.pdf</u>
- Summary of inputs on rai from CSM regional consultations: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Categorie/10/rai\_summary\_of\_points\_en.pdf</u>

### CSM Regional Consultations

- Africa: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/32/csm\_consultation\_regionale\_africaine\_rapport\_technique\_2\_5102013\_louise.pdf</u>
- Latin America: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/33/informe\_carta\_de\_acuerdo\_fao\_imca\_america\_latina.pdf</u>
- Europe & Central America: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/34/final report europe and central asia csm regional consul</u> <u>tation sept 2013 en.pdf</u>
- West Asia & North Africa: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/35/the\_final\_report\_amman.pdf</u>
- South Asia: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/36/sa\_csm\_consultation\_report\_21september2013.pdf</u>
- Southeast Asia: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/regional\_consultations-10/southeast\_asia-37/</u>

# Report of the 4<sup>th</sup> Annual CSM Forum:

http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagine/110/csm\_forum\_2013\_report\_en.pdf

CSO Messages for the 40<sup>th</sup> Session of the CFS:

- rai: http://www.csm4cfs.org/news/key\_cso\_messages\_on\_rai-145/
- Biofuels:
  - http://www.csm4cfs.org/news/open letter on biofuels in the cfs-139/
  - http://www.csm4cfs.org/news/civil society intervention after cfs biofuels decision box a doption-151/

- Investment: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/news/key\_cso\_messages\_on\_investing\_in\_smallholder\_agriculture\_for\_foo\_d\_security\_and\_nutrition-140/</u>
- Protracted crises: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/news/key\_cso\_messages\_on\_protracted\_crises-138/</u>
- GSF: http://www.csm4cfs.org/news/key\_cso\_messages\_on\_the\_gsf-144/
- Communications: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/news/communications-142/</u>
- Monitoring: <u>http://www.csm4cfs.org/news/civil\_society\_key\_points\_on\_monitoring\_cfs\_outcomes-141/</u>
- MYPOW: http://www.csm4cfs.org/news/key\_cso\_messages\_on\_cfs\_priorities-143/

# Annex 2: Timeline of Key CSM Meetings through April 2014

Meeting	Year	Date	Meeting	ТҮРЕ	CATEGORY	Description	DOCUMENT HYPERLINKS	
1	2009	14 to 17 Oct	CFS Plenary	35th Session	CFS	Reform session of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/cfs_reform-16/	
2	2010	19- Mar	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	1st meeting of the Bureau / Advisory Group		
3	2010	25- May	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/meeting reports- 18/joint bureau ag meeting reports 2	
4	2010	24- Jun	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	<u>010-34/</u>	
5	2010	17- Sep	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS		
6	2010	8 to 10 Oct	CSM Forum	1st CSM Forum	CSM	1st Annual Forum to endorse CSM Founding Document/ Location: IFAD, Rome	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/annual_csm_forum-17/2010-78/	
7	2010	11 to 15 Oct	CFS Plenary	36th Session	CFS	CSM Founding Document presented to CFS members	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/cfs_archives-20/cfs_36-29/	
8	2010	22- Nov	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/meeting_reports- 18/joint_bureau_ag_meeting_reports_2 010-34/	

9	2011	24- Feb	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	
10	2011	16- Mar	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/meeting reports-
12	2011	28- Apr	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	<u>18/joint bureau ag meeting reports 2</u> 011-33/
13	2011	25- May	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	
14	2011	30 May - 1 June	CC Meeting	1st CC Meeting	CSM	First meeting of the Coordination Committee, held in Cordoba	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/32/summary report first meeting of the_cc_30_may_1_june_2011_en.pdf
15	2011	12 to 15 July	CFS Negotiations	VGGTs	CFS	Negotiate VGGT draft	http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/land_tenure-6/
16	2011	21- Jul	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	
17	2011	1-Sep	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	
18	2011	10 to 14 Oct	CFS Negotiations	VGGTs	CFS	Negotiate VGGT draft	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/cfs archives-20/cfs 37-30/
19	2011	14 to 16 Oct	CSM Forum	2nd Annual Forum	CSM	Preparations for CFS plenary session	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/annual_csm_forum-17/2011-79/
20	2011	16- Oct	CC Meeting	2nd CC Meeting	CSM	1 day meeting of the CC held during CSM Forum	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/32/summary_report_ag_cc_meetings_ october2011_en.pdf
21	2011	17 to 22 Oct	CFS Plenary	37th Session	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/cfs_archives-20/cfs_37-30/

					1	1	
22	2011	25- Nov	OEWG	GSF	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/42/cso_interventions_during_oewg_gs f_meeting_november_2011_en.pdf
23	2011	6- Dec	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/33/joint bureau ag meeting 06 dece mber 2011.pdf
24	2011	15- Dec	OEWG	MYPOW	CFS		
25	2012	11- Jan	OEWG	MYPOW	CFS		
26	2012	13- Jan	OEWG	GSF	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/41/cso_working_document_on_the_gs f_december_2011_en.pdf
27	2012	19- Jan	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/meeting_reports- 18/joint_bureau_ag_meeting_reports_2 012-31/
28	2012	7-Feb	OEWG	GSF	CFS		
29	2012	28- Feb	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/31/cso positions bureau ag meeting 28 feb.pdf
30	2012	05 to 09 Mar	CFS Negotiations	VGGTs	CFS	Negotiate VGGT draft	http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/land_tenure-6/
31	2012	22- Mar	OEWG	Monitoring	CFS		
32	2012	3- May	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/31/briefing_notes_ag_meeting_3_may .pdf
33	2012	11- May	CFS Plenary	38th Special Session	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/land_tenure-6/
34	2012	31- May	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/meeting_reports- 18/joint_bureau_ag_meeting_reports_2 012-31/

1		1		I	1	I	1
35	2012	31- May	CFS Multi- stakeholder Dialogue	Terminology	CFS	Discuss the draft terminology document	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/10 /fsterminology_for_fao_cso_comments. pdf
36	2012	21- Jun	OEWG	Monitoring	CFS		
37	2012	26- Jun	Task Team Meetings	Social Protection	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/social_protection-14/
38	2012	27 to 29 June	CFS Negotiations	GSF	CFS	Negotiate 2nd draft of the GSF	http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/global_strategic_framework- 8/gsf_draft_2-50/
39	2012	2-Jul	OEWG	rai	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/agricultural_investment- 7/phase_1_july_2_rai_workshop-60/
40	2012	3-Jul	Task Team Meetings	Climate Change	CFS	preparation for CFS roundtable	
41	2012	13- Jul	Task Team Meetings	Climate Change	CFS	preparation for CFS roundtable	
42	2012	13- Jul	Task Team Meetings	Social Protection	CFS	preparation for CFS roundtable	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/Pagine/14 /cso_comments_4th_july.pdf
43	2012	18- Jul	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/meeting_reports- 18/joint_bureau_ag_meeting_reports_2 012-31/
44	2012	19- Jul	CFS Negotiations	GSF	CFS	Negotiate 2nd draft of the GSF	http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/global_strategic_framework- 8/gsf_draft_2-50/
45	2012	25- Jul	OEWG	rai	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/agricultural_investment- 7/phase 1 july 25 rai_workshop-61/
46	2012	26- Jul	OEWG	Monitoring	CFS		
47	2012	6-Sep	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/meeting_reports- 18/joint_bureau_ag_meeting_reports_2 012-31/

48	2012	6-Sep	OEWG	rai	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/agricultural_investment- 7/phase 1_september 6_rai_workshop- 62/
49	2012	12- Sep	CFS Multi- stakeholder Dialogue	Climate Change	CFS	preparation for CFS roundtable	
50	2012	12- Sep	CFS Multi- stakeholder Dialogue	Social Protection	CFS	preparation for CFS roundtable	
51	2012	13 to 14 Sep	High Level Expert Forum	Agenda for Action	CFS	Forum on Food Security in Protracted Crises situations	http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/protracted_crisis_conflict- 12/high_level_expert_forum-51/
52	2012	11 to 12 Oct	CC Meeting	3rd CC Meeting	CSM	2 day CC meeting prior to CSM Forum	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/32/en report 2012 csm cc meeting. pdf
53	2012	13 to 14 Oct	CSM Forum	3rd Annual Forum	CSM	Preparations for CFS plenary session	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/annual csm forum-17/2012-80/
54	2012	15 to 20 Oct	CFS Plenary	39th Session	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/cfs archives-20/cfs 39-47/
55	2012	20- Nov	OEWG	rai	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/agricultural_investment- 7/phase 2 november 20 rai_workshop- 67/
56	2012	21- Nov	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/meeting reports- 18/joint_bureau_ag_meeting_reports_2 012-31/
57	2013	18- Jan	OEWG	MYPOW	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/cfs_programme_of_work- 30/cso_priority_explanation_sheets-82/

1		1			1	1	1
							http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-
58	2013	22-	OEWG	rai	CFS		6/agricultural investment-
		Jan					7/phase 2 january 22 rai workshop-
							<u>75/</u>
							http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin
59	2013	23-	Bureau/Advisory		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	e/81/recommendations from civil socie
	_010	Jan	Group		0.0		ty to cfs bureau ag meeting 23rd jan
							uary 2013.pdf
		25-					http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-
60	2013	Jan	OEWG	Monitoring	CFS		6/monitoring and mapping-
		van					13/january_2013_oewg_meeting-77/
		12-	Bureau/Advisory				http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin
61	2013	Feb	Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	e/81/eng_cso_inputs_for_cfs_bureau_14
			0.000				_feb.pdf
		12-					http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin
61 b	2013	Mar	OEWG	MYPOW	CFS		e/83/cso messages mypow 12 march.
		IVICI					<u>pdf</u>
		12-	Task Team				http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-
62	2013	Mar	Meetings	Monitoring	CFS		6/monitoring and mapping-
		IVICI	Meetings				13/march_2013_task_team_meeting-85/
		13-	Bureau/Advisory				http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin
63	2013	Mar	Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	e/81/cso_recommendations_to_the_cfs_
		IVICI	Group				<u>bureau.pdf</u>
			Bureau/Advisory				http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin
64	2013	9-Apr	Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	e/81/cso speaking notes 13 apr13.pdf
			Group				
							http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-
65	2013	12-	Task Team	Monitoring	CFS		6/monitoring_and_mapping-
00	2015	Apr	Meetings				13/april 2013 technical task team me
							eting-88/
		6-					http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-
66	2013	May	OEWG	Monitoring	CFS		6/monitoring_and_mapping-
							<u>13/may_2013_oewg_meeting-91/</u>
		15-	Bureau/Advisory				http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin
67	2013	May	Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	<u>e/81/cso_speaking_notes_bureau_ag_m</u>
		,	Group				eeting 15 may 2013 en.pdf
		16 to					http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues-
68	2013	17	OEWG	rai	CFS		6/agricultural investment-
		May					7/phase 2 may oewg zero draft-90/

69	2013	23 to 25 May	CSM Regional Consultations	South-east Asia	CSM	Consult on rai principles and other CFS related policy issues	http://www.csm4cfs.org/regional_consul tations-10/southeast_asia-37/
70	2013	27- May	OEWG	MYPOW	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/cfs_programme_of_work- 30/cso_priority_explanation_sheets-82/
71	2013	30- May	Task Team Meetings	Monitoring	CFS		
72	2013	12- Jun	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/81/cso speaking notes en.pdf
73	2013	3-Jul	Task Team Meetings	Invest-ment	CFS	preparation for CFS roundtable	
74	2013	3-Jul	Task Team Meetings	Biofuels	CFS	preparation for CFS roundtable	
75	2013	8-Jul	OEWG	A4A	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/protracted_crisis_conflict- 12/agenda_4_action_oewg_meeting_july -96/
76	2013	11- Jul	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/81/cso_recommendations_to_cfs_bur eau_meeting.pdf
77	2013	16- Jul	Task Team Meetings	Invest-ment	CFS	preparation for CFS roundtable	
78	2013	16- Jul	Task Team Meetings	Biofuels	CFS	preparation for CFS roundtable	
79	2013	17- Jul	OEWG	MYPOW	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/cfs_programme_of_work- 30/cso_priority_explanation_sheets-82/
80	2013	18- Jul	OEWG	Monitoring	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/monitoring_and_mapping- 13/monitoring_workshop_july_2013-95/

		26 to	CSM Regional			Consult on rai principles and other	http://www.csm4cfs.org/regional consul
81	2013	28 July	Consultations	South Asia	CSM	CFS related policy issues	tations-10/south_asia-36/
82	2013	5 to 9 Aug	CSM Regional Consultations	Latin America	CSM	Consult on rai principles and other CFS related policy issues	http://www.csm4cfs.org/regional_consul tations-10/latin_america_caribbean-33/
83	2013	6- Aug	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/81/draft 2 cs briefing notes for bur eau ag 6 aug.pdf
84	2013	29- Aug	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/81/cso_briefing_notes.pdf
85	2013	10- Sep	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/81/cso_briefing_notes_10_september. pdf
86	2013	11 to 12 Sep	CSM Regional Consultations	West Asia & North Africa	CSM	Consult on rai principles and other CFS related policy issues	http://www.csm4cfs.org/regional_consul tations-10/w_asia_n_africa-35/
87	2013	12 to 13 Sep	CSM Regional Consultations	Europe & Central Asia	CSM	Consult on rai principles and other CFS related policy issues	http://www.csm4cfs.org/regional_consul tations-10/europe_central_asia-34/
88	2013	15 to 17 Sep	CSM Regional Consultations	Africa	CSM	Consult on rai principles and other CFS related policy issues	http://www.csm4cfs.org/regional_consul tations-10/africa-32/
89	2013	24- Sep	OEWG	rai	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/agricultural_investment- 7/23_24_september_oewg_meeting-

							<u>101/</u>
90	2013	3 to 4 Oct	CC Meeting	4th CC Meeting	CSM	2 day CC meeting prior to CSM Forum	NO REPORT
91	2013	05 to 06 Oct	CSM Forum	4th Annual Forum	CSM	Preparations for CFS plenary session	http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/annual csm forum-17/2013-110/
92	2013	07 to 11 Oct	CFS Plenary	40th Session	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/resources- 7/cfs_archives-20/cfs_40-106/
93	2013	28- Oct	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/81/bureau ag meeting notes 28 oct ober.pdf
93 (b)	2013	31- Oct	OEWG	A4A	CFS		http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/protracted_crisis_conflict- 12/agenda_4_action_oewg_meeting_oct ober-107/
94	2013	19- Nov	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/81/cso briefing notes 19 november. pdf
95	2013	16- Dec	Task Team Meetings	Monitoring	CFS		
96	2014	13- Jan	OEWG	MYPOW	CFS		
97	2014	15- Jan	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/113/cso_recommendations.pdf
98	2014	24- Feb	Task Team Meetings	Monitoring	CFS		
99	2014	3- Mar	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/113/cso_ag_recommendations.pdf
100	2014	5 to 6 Mar	OEWG	A4A	CFS		

CSM Evaluation - Final Report, August 2014

Christina Schiavoni and Patrick Mulvany

101	2014	22- Apr	Bureau/Advisory Group		CFS	intersessional activity of the CFS	http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/SottoPagin e/113/cso_briefing_notes_22_april.pdf
102	2014	29- Apr	OEWG	rai	CFS	Present 1st draft of rai principles	http://www.csm4cfs.org/policy_issues- 6/agricultural_investment- 7/29_april_oewg_meeting-117/

# Annex 3: CSM Expenditure 2001 – 2013

# (Euros €)

		Total Expend	liture by Yea	r€	Source of Fund	ls (3 Years)€
CSM Total Expenditure 2011 – 2013 Category	TOTAL€	2011	2012	2013	Governments via FAO	NGOs & CSOs
1. Participation in the CFS AG meetings						
sub-total	67,094	5,803	16,476	44,816	38,065	29,029
2. CSM policy working groups & participation in CFS inter-sessional activities (global)				200		
sub-total	309,328	13,974	151,299	144,055	231,600	77,728
3. Facilitating CSM regional, sub-regional and constituency consultations activities						
sub-total	402,599	-	205,124	197,475	381,697	19,774
4. Annual CSM CC meeting, CSM Forum & participation in Annual CFS Plenary						
sub-total	469,236	205,839	111,086	152,311	434,008	35,228
5. Secretariat						
sub total	323,432	75,303	112,485	135,644	216,376	107,056
6. Accountability, monitoring and contingency cost:						
sub total	28,798	-	24,142	4,656	9,680	19,118
SUB TOTAL	1,599,360	300,919	619,484	678,958	1,311,427	287,933
Administration fee (5% on some grants)	25,004	7,358	5,284	12,362		9,649
FAO Administration fee (7% on funds via FAO)	84,610	14,602	31,625	38,383	84,610	-
FAO OPCP Managerial Cost (6% on funds via FAO)	72,523	12,516	27,107	32,900		6 <b>-</b>
TOTAL	1,781,497	335,395	683,500	762,602	1,483,914	297,582

CSM Secretariat, May 2014

CSM Evaluation - Final Report, August 2014

46

# Annex 4: Terms of Reference for the CSM External Evaluation

# Terms of Reference:

# Assessment of the Civil Society Mechanism for relations with the CFS

#### 1. Overview and background

The Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) facilitates the participation of social movements and other CSOs in the work of the CFS, including input to negotiations, discussions, consultations and decision-making, while providing a space for dialogue between a wide-range of civil society actors. The CSM is inclusive of all organisations concerned with food security and nutrition at all levels in all parts of the world.

The Coordination Committee (CC) of the Civil Society Mechanism met during October 2013 and decided to do an evaluation of the performance and functioning of the CSM.

#### 2. Objectives of the evaluation

The objectives of the evaluation are to explore proposals about how:

- 4) to strengthen and/or widen the scope of participation of small-scale food providers, workers, social movements and food insecure communities in the CSM;
- 5) the CSM could be stronger and better able to set the agenda of the CFS? Why is it not able to impose its agenda on the CFS agenda?; and
- 6) to improve the functioning of the CSM.

Based on these objectives, it is important that all the main bodies of the CSM process should participate in the evaluation, including all members of the Advisory Group, Coordinating Committee and the CSM Secretariat, key members of Working Groups, some other participants in the CSM annual meeting and some members of the interpretation/translation team.

The Terms of Reference, adopted by the CSM and acknowledged by the CFS in October 2010, entitled "Proposal for an International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism for Relations with the CFS", provide the baseline for this assessment of performance of the CSM.

### 3. Methodology

The suggested methodology for the evaluation is a process that is based on a written questionnaire to be sent to current and previous CC/AG members, key working group members and other CSM actors, as well as present and former CSM secretariat members. In addition, an input from some of the interpreters, whose contribution has been essential to the functioning of the CSM, will be sought. As discussed in the October CC meeting, it is suggested that those who wish to do so could answer the questionnaires through a phone interview, should they request this.

The questionnaires include different types of questions for reflecting on both the performance of the CC/AG, CSM Secretariat, the Working Groups and the CSM meetings. The questionnaires include questions about each individual's engagement in the CSM process and questions about what went well, what was challenging, what hindered progress and potential ways forward in relation to the functioning of all structures of the CSM. The evaluation/assessment process will also include reference to previous assessments of, and reports on, the work of the CSM and its Working Groups.

The responses, summaries of reports and earlier assessments will be analysed, collated and written up by the Consultants. They will subsequently work with the AG in developing and facilitating a meeting of the CC at which the issues raised will be further considered, using participatory assessment methods.

The CC members of the AG will facilitate and coordinate the assessment, with summarised information provided to the Consultants by the Secretariat, as necessary.

The mode of operation of the Consultants is to 1) actively engage as many CC members as possible in the process, and 2) ensure that the assessment is objective and neutral.

#### 4. Timeline

The approximate timeline for the evaluation and subsequent internal reflection is:::

- December: draft questionnaires translated and circulated to CC members for comment.
- April: the AG selects and contracts the Consultants
- April: questionnaires sent to CC members and others by Secretariat
- 25 April/ 5 May : deadline for the Consultants to receive responses (by email)
- 1-15 May, Secretariat provides summaries of relevant information, as requested by the Consultants.
- 5-20 May: the Consultants follow-up some of the questionnaires with phone calls etc;; prepare draft of first (external) report
- 23 May: draft report in English delivered to the AG
- June: the Consultants follow-up responses, and, with the members of the AG, prepare CC meeting, at which the findings are discussed.

#### 5. Main tasks and outputs

The assessment process is designed to help the CC identify how it can improve the effectiveness and functioning of the CSM, The main tasks are:

- 1. Circulate the questionnaire and collate responses, including some follow-up by phone calls and face to face interviews, if possible
- 2. Prepare a report based on responses, interviews, documentation and other information.
- Facilitate an internal reflection in the CC about what needs to change in order to ensure the proper functioning of the CSM in line with its original objectives in the CSM Founding Document.

The Consultants will report regularly to the AG and will be supported by the Secretariat

#### 6. What materials/information are to be provided to the Consultants?

Completed questionnaires and other information provided in writing and orally by respondents. Summaries of CSM documents, lists of reports etc. that are relevant for the assessment, to be prepared by the Secretariat

# Annex 5: Programme for CSM Evaluation

DATE	ΑCTIVITY	who
April 2014	Initial contact with CSM Secretariat	Patrick Mulvany (PM)
		&
		Christina Schiavoni (CS)
Mid-April	Formalisation of the review process	Advisory Group members (AG)
April/May	Send out Questionnaires	Secretariat
	Identify and review key reports, papers etc. Request summarised information from the Secretariat.	PM and CS with advice and input from Secretariat
	Conduct telephone / Skype interviews	CS and PM
May	Analyse information and prepare draft report	PM and CS
June	Follow-up process to aid internal reflection by CC members	PM and CS with AG
June	Skype Meeting With AG members to prepare the CC meeting	AG with CS and PM
June/July	Meeting of the Coordination Committee	CC with CS and PM

### **Annex 6: Questionnaire for CSM Assessment**

#### General information:

Name:

What bodies and processes have you been involved in within the CSM? (please choose all that apply)

- a. Advisory Group
- b. Finance Committee
- c. Coordinating Committee
- d. Coordinating groups for events (regional consultations, annual CSM, FAO regional conferences, ... ) (please list)
- e. Working Groups (please list)
- f. Organizing side events
- q. Others:

How long have you been involved with the CSM process?

What region/constituency do you represent?

Are you a member of a social movement, food insecure community, NGO, or other body/institution?

What is the decision-making process within your constituency or sub-region?

How has your sub-region/region integrated input from global constituency? Or how has your global constituency shared input within the sub-regions/regions?

Below are proposed core questions that could be posed for each body/group in question. If necessary, adjustments can be made to be specific to the task and functions of each individual group. The following groups are suggested to be assessed with these basic questions: Advisory Group, Coordinating Committee, and CSM secretariat (a separate set of questions are proposed for the working groups, and a separate process for the work of the interpreters)

- 1. What work has gone well within this group? What positive interactions and outputs have emerged?
- 2. What were the challenges and gaps within the functioning of this group?
- 3. Was there adequate inclusion of social movements and food insecure communities? And if not, how can it be improved?
- 4. How did this group impact the strategic and political goals of the CSM? a. How can the CSM more effectively influence the agenda of the CFS?
- 5. What are the recommendations to improve the function of this group?

### Questions for Participants in Working Groups and Other Initiatives of the CSM

(\*\*If you have been involved in more than one working group or other CSM-related body, please copy these questions and answer them separately for each different group that you are part of.)

- 1. How was participation in the group?
  - a. How many times did the group meet in the past 2 years?
  - b. In what capacity (e.g. Skype, telephone, face-to-face)?

  - c. How many persons were involved in the group?d. Was there regional, gender, age, and constituency balance?
  - e. How many social movements were involved?
  - f. How were you personally involved in the work of the working group?

- 2. Were the political aims clearly communicated? To what extent have they been achieved? And if not, what were the obstacles?
- 3. How was communication within the group?
  - a. In what language was the group facilitated?
  - b. Did you feel sufficiently involved in the decision-making processes? If not, why?
  - c. Was your preferred method of communication used? If not, what should it have been?
- 4. How was the capacity of group facilitation?
- 5. How was support from the CC, Advisory Group and the CSM Secretariat?
- 6. How do you propose the working group could function better?
- 7. If you were a facilitator, what were the major obstacles and how did you overcome them?
- 8. Please feel free to share any further feedback below. Thank you!

### Annex 7: The consultants assigned to conduct the Evaluation

Christina Schiavoni is an advocate and scholar working toward a PhD in agrarian studies at the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) in The Hague, Netherlands. For a decade, she worked with WhyHunger in New York City, serving as the Director of the Global Movements Program. In that capacity, she worked with diverse networks to grow and unify movements for food, land and water in the US and globally. She holds a B.S. in International Agriculture and an MA in Agrarian & Environmental Studies.

Patrick Mulvany, MA Agric Sci, C Biol, has worked with small-scale food providers worldwide; on Agricultural Research in the UK; and for ITDG/Practical Action as Senior Policy Adviser on technology, agricultural biodiversity and food sovereignty issues. He is an experienced evaluator and has conducted a number of international evaluations in recent years for example for GRAIN international (Scandinavian and other donors); Friends of the Earth International (Oxfam NOVIB); Via Campesina – International Secretariat (backfunded by NORAD and others); SADC Seed Security Network (for SDC). He works through Kamayoq, a consultancy.

Although neither has any function currently in the CSM, they have both been involved in the past. Christina was formerly the North American CC member. Patrick, as former chair of the UK Food Group, an NGO network concerned with global food issues, has been interacting with the CSM since its inception.

### **Annex 8: The CSM Founding Document**

Attached is the original proposal to the CFS for setting up an International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism for Relations with CFS. It was approved by the CC in October 2010 and acknowledged by the CFS in the same month.

The document was prepared by ActionAid International, the Governance Working Group of the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty and Oxfam.

# **Table of Contents**

MATTERS TO BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF CFS	Page 1
I. BACKGROUND	Paragraphs 1 -3
II. THE CIVIL SOCIETY MECHANISM (CSM)	4 -49
A. Role and Functions	4 -8
B. Organizing Principles	9 -13
C. Participants in CFS Processes	14 -15
D. Governance and Structure	16 -38
E. Allocating Civil Society Seats in CFS Plenary Sessions	39 -44
F. Communications	45
G. Resource Requirements	46
H. Accountability and Evaluation	47 -49

H)



# **COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY**

# **Thirty-sixth Session**

# Rome, 11-14 and 16 October 2010

# PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION CIVIL SOCIETY MECHANISM FOR RELATIONS WITH CFS

This document has been prepared by ActionAid International, the Governance Working Group of the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty and Oxfam. It does not necessarily reflect the views of the CFS, its Bureau or Secretariat

# **Table of Contents**

MA	TTF	ERS TO BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF CFS	Page 1
I.	BA	CKGROUND	Paragraphs 1 - 3
II.	TH	E CIVIL SOCIETY MECHANISM (CSM)	4 - 49
	A.	Role and Functions	4 - 8
	B.	Organizing Principles	9 - 13
	C.	Participants in CFS Processes	14 - 15
	D.	Governance and Structure	16 - 38
	E.	Allocating Civil Society Seats in CFS Plenary Sessions	39 - 44
	F.	Communications	45
	G.	Resource Requirements	46
	H.	Accountability and Evaluation	47 - 49
ANI	NEX	K 1	
ANI	NEX	K 2	

ANNEX 3

This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies. Most CFS meeting documents are available on the Internet at <a href="http://www.fao.org/cfs">www.fao.org/cfs</a>. Delegates will be given an electronic copy of all documents on registration.

#### Matters to be brought to the attention of CFS

The Committee acknowledges this proposal and encourages other stakeholders to proceed along the same lines.

# I. BACKGROUND

1. The Declaration of the People's Food Sovereignty Forum held in November 2009 in parallel to the World Food Security Summit underlined the important opportunity presented by the renewal of the Committee on World Food Security: "We emphasize the fundamental importance of the renewed CFS as the foremost inclusive international policy body for food and agriculture within the UN system, and as an essential body where the knowledge and perspectives of those whose daily labours have fed humanity for generations are not only heard, but also acted upon". It further noted that "Civil society has played a fundamentally important role in the CFS reform process, opening up a critical space which we intend to fully occupy in a responsible and effective manner. In so doing we will ensure that the voices of the excluded continue to be heard at the heart of food and agricultural policy-making and governance, at all levels".

2. The reform of the CFS was crafted through the work of a Contact Group established by the CFS Bureau in which civil society organizations participated fully. One of the key achievements of civil society participants, with the support of like-minded governments, was the acknowledgement of the right of civil society organizations to autonomously organize themselves to interface with the CFS. The relevant paragraph of the CFS reform document states that:

"Civil society organizations/NGOs and their networks will be invited to autonomously establish a global mechanism for food security and nutrition which will function as a facilitating body for CSO/NGOs consultation and participation in the CFS. Such mechanisms will also serve inter-sessional global, regional and national actions in which organizations of those sectors of the population most affected by food insecurity would be accorded priority representation. Civil society organizations/NGOs will submit to the CFS Bureau a proposal regarding how they intend to organize their participation in the CFS in a way that ensures broad and balanced participation by regions and types of organizations keeping in mind the principles approved by the CFS at its Thirty-Fourth Session in October 2008 (CFS:2008/5; CL:135/10: paragraph 15)." (CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, para 16).

3. The civil society forum of November 2009 gave the civil society participants in the Contact Group a mandate to carry forward civil society interface with the CFS Bureau until the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) is operational. This mandate included the preparation of a draft proposal for an autonomous Civil Society Mechanism to relate to the CFS, for wide diffusion among CSOs concerned with food security and nutrition<sup>1</sup> (see section on Process, paras. 36-39 below).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Food security exists when all people at all times have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy lifestyle.

# II. THE CIVIL SOCIETY MECHANISM (CSM)

# A. ROLE AND FUNCTIONS

4. The essential <u>role</u> of the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) is to facilitate the participation of CSOs in the work of the CFS, including input to negotiation and decision-making. The CSM will also provide a space for dialogue between a wide range of civil society actors where different positions can be expressed and debated. The CSM will present common positions to the CFS where they emerge and the range of different positions where there is no consensus.

5. The CFS reform document suggests that, in order to fulfil its facilitation role, the CSM perform a series of *functions* including the following:

- *i) "broad and regular exchange of information, analysis and experience;*
- *ii)* developing common positions as appropriate;
- *iii)* communicating to the CFS and, as appropriate, its Bureau through representatives designated by an internal self-selection process within each civil society category;
- iv) convening a civil society forum as a preparatory event before CFS sessions if so decided by the civil society mechanism." (CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, para. 16)

6. The CSM reserves the right to take on other functions. The CSM will facilitate participation in both inter-sessional activities (activities that take place between the annual CFS Plenary Sessions) and the CFS Plenary Sessions held in proximity to World Food Day in October each year.

# **Year-round Activities**

7. The new CFS is not limited to an annual meeting. Rather, it is intended that there will be an on-going Work Programme implemented by the Bureau with inputs from the Advisory Group and the High Level Panel of Experts. The Work Programme will prepare the CFS Plenary Sessions and follow up on their conclusions and decisions. It will be coherent with the roles of CFS, will include the gathering of lessons learnt from national and regional levels, the development of policy guidance and the Global Strategic Framework, facilitating international support to national plans of action etc. All participants in the CFS process, including CSOs, are invited to contribute to inter-sessional activities of the CFS at various levels, from national to regional to global. The CSM is expected to facilitate and, where necessary, coordinate this process. Most of the year-round activities will be taking place at local, national and regional levels. As the reform of the CFS is put into operation, the CSM will need to develop ways of supporting civil society engagement in year-round activities at all levels and building links among them. The CSM will facilitate participation of CSOs participating in multi-stakeholder food security governance structures at national and regional levels. Activities may include, lobbying and advocacy, shared learning, promotion of specific working groups, capacity building, and monitoring and preparation of specific proposals to be discussed by the CFS Plenary sessions.

# **CFS Plenary Sessions**

8. The CSM will dialogue with the CFS Bureau regarding the allocation of civil society seats in the annual CFS Plenary Sessions. The relevant paragraph of the CFS reform document states that:

"The Bureau will determine the allocation of seats for Participants and Observers [in the CFS Plenary] in consultation with the CSO/NGO coordination mechanisms. The quota assigned to civil society organizations and NGOs will be such as to ensure their visible and effective participation, equitable geographic representation, with particular attention to the categories of organizations detailed in paragraph 11(ii). (CFS:2009/2Rev.2, para 15).

The procedure by which the CSM will develop its proposal for the allocation of seats is described below.

# **B.** ORGANISING PRINCIPLES

9. The CSM will be an inclusive space open to all civil society organizations: it will involve the full range of constituencies concerned about and affected by hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition, including social movements and NGOs, particularly those from developing countries, those affected by hunger and those committed to the realization of the right to food and food sovereignty.

10. The CSM will ensure that a wide range of views can be heard on how to address the problems of hunger, malnutrition and violations of the right to food. Priority will be given to ensuring that the voices of smallholder producers, fisherfolk, pastoralists, indigenous, urban poor, migrants, agricultural workers etc. are heard.<sup>2</sup> Particular priority will be given to peasant and indigenous food producers and workers affected by hunger and marginalization because they represent a large majority of the hungry people in the world and produce the largest proportion of the food in the world. The CSM will make special efforts to support the capacity of the marginalized to follow and participate in the CFS process.

11. The CSM will respect pluralism, autonomy and self-organization. It will ensure a balance of gender, regions and constituencies and sectors.

12. Participation within the CSM should aim to preserve unity and solidarity amongst CSOs, but should not imply a flattening of the diversity that exists between civil society in terms of objectives, strategies, and content. However, decision-making mechanisms should be agreed by the CSM's Coordination Committee (see para. 26) in order to strengthen cooperation amongst all participants and allow common positions when possible.

13. The CSM will avoid creating a bureaucratic structure in Rome, but will have a permanent secretariat, which will have a neutral role, dedicated to facilitating the functions of the CSM as well as providing inter-sessional support to the four civil society members of the Advisory Group (see paras 35-37 below).

# C. PARTICIPANTS IN CFS PROCESSES

14. As stipulated in the CFS reform document, the CSM will give clear priority to organizations of the people most affected by hunger, recognizing that victims of hunger are also the bearers of solutions. Membership of the Coordination Committee of the CSM and participation in CFS Plenary Sessions will be both on a regional and constituency basis and will also ensure gender balance. The CSM will use the following constituencies<sup>3</sup> referred to in the CFS reform document:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> One of the key organizing principles is for self organized groups to speak for themselves in the CSM and have a greater representation in the mechanism; of these self organized constituencies, smallholder producers have a larger number of spaces in the coordination mechanism because they represent the majority of the world's hungry; they also hold in large parts solutions to addressing hunger sustainably. Whilst recognising and affirming the role of self organised constituencies, the CSM will ensure that issues and voices of those who are unable to organise finds space within the CSM.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> It is important to make a distinction between two different types of constituencies mentioned here: while NGOs are organisations that represent the interests of a particular theme or support the interests of certain social groups, the other constituencies are self-organised social actors who share a common identity and have come together to represent their *own* interests. In this sense, an organisation that represents the concerns of children, for example, but is not composed of and governed by children, would be classified as an NGO. It is recognized that some groups face difficulties in organising themselves (i.e. children), therefore it is the responsibility of each constituency to ensure that their interests are taken into account. Finally, it would be useful, over the coming year, to further explore the NGO constituency, as

- a) "smallholder family farmers,
- b) artisanal fisherfolk,
- c) herders/pastoralists,
- d) landless,
- e) urban poor,
- f) agricultural and food workers,
- g) women,
- h) youth,
- i) consumers,
- j) Indigenous Peoples,
- k) NGOs<sup>4</sup>";

15. During consultations on the establishment of the CSM, a number of additional constituencies have been suggested. However, it is proposed that the constituencies listed in the CFS Reform Document (CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, para. 11 ii) be taken as the basis for the establishment of the CSM to help ensure its smooth and rapid interaction with the CFS starting with the 36th Session in October 2010. Following an evaluation of the first year of the functioning of the CSM, the Coordination Committee might decide to make changes to the constituencies. However, the CSM recognizes the principle that no CSO actively working on food issues should be excluded from the CSM, therefore the definition of each constituency should be flexible enough so that each organization fits into at least one constituency.

# D. GOVERNANCE AND STRUCTURES

# Members

16. All CSOs/NGOs and social movements active in the area of food and nutrition at any level, particularly those that represent food producers, consumers, and other actors directly involved in producing and consuming food who want to participate in CFS processes will be considered eligible to be participants in the Mechanism and to benefit from the information provision, facilitated participation in CFS processes and events and other such services that the Mechanism may be able to provide.

17. National and regional movements, CSOs/NGOs and their platforms, networks and mechanisms. CSOs/NGOs will be encouraged to group together at national and regional levels in order to participate more effectively in policy and programme processes concerning food security and nutrition. Already existing regional CSOs/NGOs, their organizations, platforms and networks dealing with food security and nutrition, particularly those which follow the main lines and principles of this document and are already engaged in dialogue with regional or national authorities, will therefore be accepted as participants in the global CSM. If any CSOs/NGOs take the initiative to organize new regional or national civil society mechanisms these should also follow the main lines and principles of the current document and their application to, and participation in, the global CSM will be considered. The identification of such bodies and their adherence to the global CSM will take place progressively. National platforms, networks and mechanisms may wish to group themselves by region as soon as regional structures are in place. The regional mechanisms should maintain a facilitating role and engage with regional institutions in an on-going basis to help prepare positions and participants for the global meetings. It is hoped that regional CSO/NGOs consultations in conjunction with Regional FAO Conferences will be able to play a role in this regard.

the current formulation (footnote in paragraph 13) does not capture the variety of types of organisations that make up this constituency.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> This term refers to International NGOs, National NGOs and NGO Platforms.

### **Annual Civil Society Forum**

18. The Coordination Committee will facilitate the organization of a civil society meeting every year if possible and strategic, just prior to the annual CFS session. The meeting will be open to all interested civil society participants that are members of the CSM. For decision making a balance among constituencies and regions is important. Appropriate mechanisms, including possibilities to vote when consensus is lacking, will be established. The Coordination Committee will propose, guidelines regarding which kinds of questions can be the subject of decision by vote and which require consensus. The meeting will provide an important occasion for exchanging information, discussing priority food security and nutrition issues, identifying priorities for civil society advocacy and, eventually deliberating common positions to be taken to the annual CFS Plenary. If there is not consensus, positions presented to the CFS will state clearly the names of the organizations, which endorse them. Any statements that result from these interactions will not be made available on the website of the CS Mechanism unless they are adopted by consensus. In the case that there is no consensus, the organizations that support the statement can make those statements available on their own websites.

## **Coordination Committee**

19. The Coordination Committee is responsible for ensuring that the functions of the CSM are carried out as effectively as possible and according to the organizing principles.

20. A Coordination Committee for the CSM will be established, composed of constituency and sub-regional focal points as follows: 4 focal points from smallholder family farmer organizations and 2 from each of the other constituencies mentioned above, and 1 focal point from each sub-region (suggested breakdown: North America, Central America and Caribbean, Andean Region, Southern Cone, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, West Asia, South Asia, South East Asia, Central Asia, Oceania and Pacific, Southern Africa, West Africa, East Africa, Central Africa, North Africa). As mentioned above, priority is given to small-scale farmers because they represent 80% of the hungry people in the world and produce the largest proportion of the food in the world.<sup>5</sup>

21. Each focal point will hold the function for 12 months during 2010/11 and for a period of 2 years thereafter.

22. Gender and geographic balance among the focal points in the CSM Coordination Committee has to be ensured. International movements, CSOs NGOs and their platforms or networks participating in the CFS should aim for 50% women participation. This can be achieved by asking each constituency to nominate one man and one woman from two different regions to occupy their 2 slots in the Coordination Committee. Over time each constituency has to demonstrate that they have chosen focal points from all the regions.

23. Each constituency and sub-regions will decide through a process of internal negotiation what process they will establish for Coordination Committee member selection, while adhering to regional and gender balance as outlined above and to the principle of transparency. It is suggested that each constituency/sub-region might establish a council of focal points representing the major organizations/networks in that constituency/sub-region and that members of this council might sit on the Coordination Committee in rotation for a period of 2 years each. The process of Coordination Committee member selection and outcomes will be documented and made available to all CSOs and others.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> While there have been some calls to reduce the size of the Coordination Committee for the sake of efficiency and functionality, the drafting committee felt that the current size - in which all sub-regions and constituencies are represented - was essential for building trust and ownership of the process. It was also noted that the 4 AG members play a key role in inter-sessional activities and would therefore help to ensure efficiency of decision-making in the Coordination Committee.

24. The process in the first year may not be as inclusive as we hope it will become, but it should be transparent. The methodology for selecting Coordination Committee members will be improved according to the evaluation of the first year and with the experience of subsequent years.

25. The Coordination Committee will meet face to face at least once a year and virtually once every quarter.

26. The Coordination Committee will make decisions on the functioning of the CSM such as: criteria for participation in the CSM, quotas for participation in the CFS Plenary, selection of civil society members of the Advisory Group, providing support to the CSO Advisory Group members, and assisting in the organization of the civil society forums related to the CFS.

27. Decisions will be made through systematic consultation with participants in the CSM. The Coordination Committee will reflect on the kinds of issues for which broader consultation are most important in the interest of empowering the CSM as a whole. Decisions will be made by consensus wherever possible. The Coordination Committee will determine which kind of decisions require consensus and which should be made through voting if no consensus emerges, and to adopt what voting modalities. The Coordination Committee's decisions on this question will be taken at the outset of its operations and will be made public. It should be noted that silence will not be taken for consent, and the views of all Committee members will be clarified when seeking consensus. In any case, all divergent positions will be noted and reported.

28. When the CSM provides advice to the CFS through its Coordination Committee, it will seek to communicate the range of divergent positions that are held by participants in the CSM.

29. The Coordination Committee will be responsible for dialogue with the CFS Bureau regarding the allocation of civil society seats in the annual CFS plenary sessions. It should be noted that membership in the Coordination Committee does not guarantee automatic participation in the annual CFS plenary sessions.

# Civil society members of the CFS Advisory Group

30. The role of the Advisory Group is to bring the views of the non-voting CFS participants, including civil society, to the Bureau of the CFS and "to provide input to the Bureau regarding the range of tasks which the CFS Plenary has instructed it to perform" (CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, para.32). It also has a role in nurturing and maintaining linkages with different actors at regional, sub regional and local levels (CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, para. 23), including the large number of civil society networks operating at the regional and national levels (CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, paras. 25 and 28).

31. The CSM is responsible for communicating to the Bureau the names of the persons who will fill the places in the Advisory Group allocated to civil society (currently 4 places). The process for doing so is described below.

32. The role of the civil society members of the Advisory Group will not be one of representation but rather of facilitating two-way communication between the Bureau and the CSM. The essential tasks of the civil society AG members will be to share information and to present the range of views of the CSM and any common positions that CSOs may have developed. They will share the agendas of upcoming Advisory Group and Bureau meetings with all members of the CSM via the website and other means of communication and solicit comments which they will share with the Advisory Group. Other aspects of their role may be clarified progressively as the functioning of the Advisory Group itself is clarified. It is essential that, as much as possible, all regions, constituencies, organizations, networks and sectors have the opportunity to follow and feed into the work of the Advisory Group through the Coordination Committee. The civil society Advisory Group members will coordinate among themselves and through the Coordination Committee to ensure as a collective the maximum possible participation. The AG will respect the organizing principles of the CSM. In line with the

organizational principles of the CSM it will be essential to ensure that organizations and networks from affected constituencies in developing countries are given priority in being able to participate in and inform the work of the AG.

33. The Civil Society members of the Advisory Group, currently four, will be elected by and among the members of the Coordination Committee, according to their ability to perform the role expected of them and respecting the priority given to small food producer constituencies. They will constitute a collective of four people who have the trust of the Coordination Committee and will be allocated on a rotational basis for a 2-year period (one year during the first 12 months of operation of the CSM). This is in line with the term for focal points of the Coordination Committee and will help ensure all regions/constituencies are able to feed into the work of the Advisory Group.

34. Key selection criteria include:

- Ability to participate regularly in Advisory Group meetings in person or via tele-conference and video conferencing facilities
- Demonstrable commitment to the organizing principles of the CSM, especially inclusiveness and prioritizing input from those most affected by hunger
- Ability to network with a broad range of constituencies, organizations, networks and sectors
- Communication and networking skills
- The overall balance of the Advisory Group seats should reflect the principle of gender balance and the priority given to constituencies representing those most affected by food insecurity.

35. Civil society Advisory Group members, particularly those from social movements, will need significant support in order that they themselves are able to participate effectively (e.g. translated documents, interpretation, flights, accommodation, etc.) and in order that they can facilitate the participation of other civil society actors (through emails, administration of web sites, organization of telecoms, face to face meetings etc). Much of this support will be provided by the CSM Secretariat but they may also require some support from within their own organizations and movements as well as funding from the CSM.

# **The Secretariat**

36. A light Secretariat will be established in Rome to provide support to members of the CSM, the Coordination Committee, civil society members of the Advisory Group and to help organize the annual Civil Society Forum.

37. The Secretariat will report to the Coordination Committee. Its role will be administrative, facilitating the functioning of the CSM by performing financial, logistical and communication tasks. It will be politically neutral and will not perform advocacy and lobbying roles.

38. Members of the Secretariat will require experience facilitating the participation of a wide range of civil society actors, particularly social movements from the South, in policy dialogue and governance mechanisms. Language skills, particularly English, Spanish and French, will also be another important criteria taken into consideration.

# E. ALLOCATING CIVIL SOCIETY SEATS IN CFS PLENARY SESSIONS

39. There may be a limit on civil society seats in the CFS Plenary Sessions in the future, and there will certainly be a limit on the number of civil society participants who are able to speak during the Plenary Sessions. Seats and speaking slots allocated to CSOs in CFS meetings will be distributed among the constituencies and the sub-regions by the Coordination Committee. A quota

system will ensure that priority is given to voices from developing countries and to the constituencies most affected by hunger according to the organizing principles of the CSM.

40. As stated above, membership in the Coordination Committee does not guarantee automatic participation in the annual CFS plenary sessions

41. Seats will be allocated in a balanced way following the criteria suggested for the Coordination Committee itself (see paras. 19 - 21) and their possible contribution to the discussion of the items on the agenda of the CFS session.

42. Information about annual CFS Plenary Sessions will be put on the CSM website and sent to the e-mail list.

43. Organizations wishing to attend the CFS session will be requested to fill in an online form which asks them to detail their organization, areas of work and organizational affiliations, which agenda item they are most interested in, and what they think they can contribute to the discussion.

44. All the forms will be sent to the Coordination Committee, which will decide seat allocation taking into account the concrete technical or political contribution. Regional and gender balance and the relevance of the CFS agenda to each constituency and region will influence the acceptance of specific applications. Participants will be given sufficient notice in order for them to organize travel, visas etc.

# F. COMMUNICATIONS

45. The Coordination Committee will establish, with the support of the secretariat, an email list and website. All relevant information will be posted on the website in English, French and Spanish. Any interested CSO will be able to sign up to receive the emails by registering their email address on the website.

# G. RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

46. The resources necessary to ensure effective civil society participation in the CFS process should be addressed in calculating the budgetary requirements of the CFS, as indicated in the CFS reform document (CFS:2009/2 Rev.2, para. 50). These requirements include travel costs for CSO participants from developing countries, website development and updating, secretariat staff, translation and office expenses.<sup>6</sup> While responsibility for ensuring full and active participation of CSOs in the CFS process falls on the CSM, financial resources must be made available and provided by participating governments and where possible, better resourced NGOs.

# H. ACCOUNTABILITY AND EVALUATION

47. Elements of accountability:

- The Coordination Committee will be accountable to CSOs worldwide working on food security and nutrition on the one hand, and the CFS on the other
- The Coordination Committee will maintain an updated website and email list and issue an annual report detailing its activities over the previous year. These tools will be the main devices to facilitate and encourage accountability

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> A budget for the first two years will be developed in the course of finalizing this document and presented to the CFS Bureau along with the proposal for the CSM.

- While each focal point will naturally be responsible first and foremost to their own constituency, the Coordination Committee will collectively be responsible for all its actions to all CSOs
- Participants in the CSM will be able to feedback on the quality of their participation, the performance of the Coordination Committee and Advisory Group Focal Points and make suggestions as to how to improve the functioning of the CSM
- The mechanisms for accountability of any regional or national CSMs that may be established will be clarified once initiatives in that direction have been taken, but will follow the principles that underlie the current document
- The mechanisms of accountability, detailed below, will be reviewed after 3 years and any necessary changes will be made by the Coordination Committee.

48. The CSM's email list and website (available, at least, in English, French and Spanish, subject to availability of funding) will be the main tools for outreach. The website will contain the following information which will also be distributed through the email list:

- a) The current document
- b) Link to the CFS website
- c) Process and timeline for selecting the Coordination Committee focal points for the upcoming 2-year term and an email address to contact for further information
- d) List of current and previous Coordination Committee focal points
- e) Directory of the CSM participants
- Dates and agendas of annual CFS Plenary Sessions; number of seats allocated to CSOs in CFS sessions and an online form to request participation in the sessions
- g) Dates and agendas of upcoming Advisory Group and Bureau meetings, past meeting minutes; an online form to submit comments regarding points on the agenda of the Advisory Group
- h) Date of the annual meeting of CSOs that will take place each year before the CFS
- i) Annual Report of the Coordination Committee (see below)
- j) Any joint statements that are approved by consensus (of the Coordination Committee or participants in the annual meeting as the case may be).

49. The Annual Report of the Coordination Committee will include the following information:

- a) Outreach: Summary of the steps taken to share information about CFS processes to CSOs worldwide (number of "hits" on the website, number of CSOs receiving the email list, details of efforts made to diffuse information about the email list and website)
- b) Selection of focal points to the CSM: Each constituency will document the process for selecting their focal points, including the specific names of the organizations involved in the selection process, as well as efforts that were made to ensure regional and gender balance
- c) Allocation of CFS Plenary seats to civil society participants: List of all organizations requesting to participate in each CFS session, the final list of participants (indicating regional and gender balance), and a summary of the criteria for selection
- d) Advisory Group: Summary of criteria and process for choosing CSO appointees to the Advisory Group and details of efforts to ensure regional, constituency and gender balance together with the insurance that the most active organization in the CFS process are present;

e) Facilitation of participation of CSOs in intersessional activities: The number and summary of all comments on the agenda items of the Advisory Group; summary of contributions and outcomes of the Advisory Group process<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The Peoples' Food Sovereignty Forum of November 2009 indicated that "CSOs will evaluate both the performance of the CFS and their own performance in three years."

# **ANNEX 1: ANNUAL BUDGET**

em N	r	Single cost Nr in Euros da	ys/times	Total (Euros) T	idtal (USD)
			ys/unes		
Participation of CSO reps in the					
Advisory Group					
Policy and technical support	4 people	3,000€	12 months	144,000€	\$196,27
Flights	4 people	700€	6 meetings 3days x 6	16,800€	\$22,89
Accommodation and food	4 people	120€	18 meetings	8,640€	\$11,77
Visas, insurances and local transport	4 people	100€	6 meetings	2,400€	\$3,27
sub-total					\$234,22
Coordination Committee and Working					
Groups					
Meetings and telecons (flights, visas,					
accommodation, interpretation etc)	40 people	350€	12 months	168,000€	\$228,99
Preparation work and logistics					
(production of documents, operating					
costs)	1 lump sum	1,100€	12 months	13,200€	\$17,99
Outreach, consultations and capacity					
building within constituencies and sub-					
regions	40 people	400€	12 months	192,000€	\$261,70
sub total					\$508,69
Secretariat					
	full time				
Coordinator	1 staff	4,500€	12 months	54,000€	\$73,60
	part time				
Communications officer	1 staff	3,000€	6 months	18,000€	\$24,53
	full time	-			
Policy officer	1 staff	3,000€	12 months	36,000€	\$49,07
	part time				
Finance / admin officer	1 staff	3,000€	6 months	18,000€	\$24,53
Operating costs (renting, computers,		,		,	. ,
telephone, photocopies)	1 office	3,000€	12 months	36,000€	\$49,07
Translation of documents and website	12 months	2,000€	1 lump sum	24,000€	\$32,71
sub total		2,000 0	2 1011 \$ 50111	,	\$253,52
Accountability, monitoring and					, <b>,-</b>
evaluation					
Independent evaluation, Feedback					
mechanism, Annual Report, Audit etc	12 months	500€	1 lump sum	6,000€	\$8,17
sub total					\$8,17

TOTAL

\$1,004,622

### **ANNEX 2: CONTEXT**

### N.B. This Annex is to provide background to Civil Society Organizations on the CFS and the Civil Society Mechanism and should not be considered an integral part of the document to be endorsed by the Committee

### ROLE AND PURPOSE OF THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY

The Committee on World Food Security (CFS) has been reformed to strengthen its role as a global policy forum deliberating on food policy issues following a year of negotiations among governments, CSOs and UN bodies.

#### Why was the CFS reformed?

The dramatic rise in food prices in 2007-2008 and the resulting riots in cities throughout the world, and an increase by 150 million in the number of hungry people highlighted the failure of the system of global decision-making on food and agriculture and created the momentum necessary to make changes to this system. There are often contradictory policies and more efforts are needed to ensure policy coherence among the different international institutions, prioritizing the promotion and protection of food and nutrition security for all above other interests. There is also a need to promote the interests of small-scale food producers and poor consumers (i.e. the people most vulnerable to and affected by food insecurity and malnutrition) to develop sustainable models of production and consumption and tackle the underlying causes of malnutrition. In the efforts to redefine structures for the global governance of food and agriculture, CSOs argued for a common space at the international level where all countries would have an equal say and where CSOs would be active participants in the debate. Along with a number of governments and international institutions, many CSOs argued that the existing Committee on World Food Security (CFS) could be reformed to play this role.

#### What will be the role of the new CFS?

According to the agreements, the reformed CFS, as the foremost body of global food security governance, will have the role of promoting global coordination, policy convergence, facilitating support and advice to countries and regions, promoting coordination at national and regional levels, promoting accountability and sharing best practices and developing a Global Strategic Framework. Governments would commit themselves to translating the Global Strategic Framework into national action plans with the participation of all stakeholders to improve coordinated action.

For the first time in the history of the UN system, representatives of small-scale food producers and other civil society organizations, along with private sector associations and other stakeholders, will be full participants and not just observers of the intergovernmental process.

The CFS reform document states: "CFS Members States are encouraged, at their discretion, to constitute or strengthen multidisciplinary national mechanisms ... including all key stakeholders dedicated to advance food security at national and local levels."

Civil society will be a formal participant in the new Committee on World Food Security (CFS). Even in the annual global meeting, although voting rights will continue to be reserved for member governments, civil society and non-governmental organizations and their networks will be "non-voting participants"<sup>8</sup>. This means that they will have the right to intervene in plenary and breakout discussions, to contribute to the preparation of meeting documents and agendas and to present documents and proposals. The opening up of this space should increase social participation in international policy making, contributing, hopefully, to more effective food security and nutrition strategies.

The CFS will no longer be limited to a single global session each year. It is foreseen that a series of on-going activities will take place between one session and another, linking national, regional and global levels, in which CSOs will have an important role to play.

#### What is the CSO Mechanism?

In order to play its part in this new international institutional framework, it is foreseen that civil society will build its own autonomous mechanism for participation in CFS activities, discussion, negotiation and decision-making. The CSO Mechanism will maintain a neutral and facilitative role, whereby voices from all CSOs will be recognized. The present draft proposal is an initial effort in this direction. It is important to underline that, although this particular mechanism is a new one, we are by no means starting from zero. On the contrary we are building on the extensive networking experience that civil society organizations have accumulated in a range of policy areas and we are extracting lessons from existing examples of mechanisms of interface between civil society and multilateral institutions, including the IPC, the Farmers' Forum, the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, various NGO coordination mechanisms and others.

In this document CSOs refers to: non-state and not-for-profit actors such as: small food providers' organizations, social movements; Indigenous Peoples; community groups; and a broad range of non-governmental organizations providing services and/or conducting advocacy in the areas of food security and nutrition. The term does not include business associations, which are recognized in the CFS reform document as belonging to the private sector constituency.

It is acknowledged that the Civil Society Mechanism needs to evolve over time and that adjustments will be needed, particularly, after experiences gained in its first year of operation (2010/11). However, every effort will be made to ensure that processes to select members of the Coordination Committee, members of the CFS Advisory Group, participants in the CFS Plenary Sessions and to generally facilitate the participation of the broadest range of civil society actors, are as inclusive and as transparent as possible. Recognizing the challenges of establishing a global CSM of this nature, focal points will be selected to CSM and CFS roles for an initial period of one year. An evaluation of the CSM will be held in October 2011 and improvements made to its functioning, including the composition of the Coordination Committee (in terms of regional, gender and constituency balance). Subsequently, post holders will be selected for a 2-year period in line with the procedures of the CFS itself.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Civil society organizations are not the only non-voting participants of the CFS; the full list includes: representatives of UN agencies and bodies, CSO/NGOs, International agricultural research systems, such as the CGIAR, International and regional Financial Institutions including World Bank, International Monetary Fund, regional development banks and World Trade Organization (WTO), and representatives of private sector associations and private philanthropic foundations.

## ANNEX 3:

# KEY PRINCIPLES COMING OUT OF WORKING GROUP 1 OF THE PEOPLES' FOOD SOVEREIGNTY FORUM 2009 REGARDING CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION WITHIN THE CFS

# N.B. This Annex is to provide background to Civil Society Organizations on the CFS and the Civil Society Mechanism and should not be considered an integral part of the document to be endorsed by the Committee

- CSO participation in the CFS has to privilege the most affected, including smallholder producers, fisherfolk, pastoralists, indigenous people, urban poor, migrants, agricultural workers etc.
- The renewed CFS needs an overarching gender perspective, especially given the shift in focus towards smallholder producers, of which women are the primary agents. CSO groups participating within the CFS should aim for 50% women participation.
- Participation within the civil society coordinating mechanism should aim to preserve the unity and solidarity created amongst CSOs in this process, but should not imply a flattening of the diversity that exists between civil society in terms of objectives, strategies, and content. Strategies of association have to reflect this.
- New funding mechanisms being established in response to the food crisis should be linked to the CFS.
- A renewed CFS has to have strong links to local, national and regional level, in order to contribute to assisting the struggles of actors to open up spaces of governance and policy-making at those levels, and to ensure that the perspectives and knowledge of locally based actors is heard and acted upon.
- The CFS has to be a space in which CSOs can advance their own content and produce social change.
- The CSO contact group should continue in its work unchanged and start working out the details of CSO participation in the CFS.
- Those with the capacity NGOs etc must continue to help those lacking in capacity the illiterate, marginalized to follow the CFS process with helpful information distribution.
- National platforms have to mobilize as broad a section of society as possible.
- The CSO autonomous mechanism has to avoid creating a bureaucratic structure in Rome.
- Intersectoral representation within the CSO mechanism is very important need a wide range of views.
- It is necessary to give more value to peasant and indigenous production mechanisms under threat.
- CSOs will evaluate both the performance of the CFS and their own performance in three years.